

# **A SOCIALIST IN CONGRESS: His Conduct and Responsibilities**

**by Daniel DeLeon**

**Price 50 cents**

**A Socialist  
In Congress:  
His Conduct and  
Responsibilities**

*By Daniel De Leon*

This pamphlet answers the question: How would a Socialist act if he were elected to Congress or to other high office?

The Marxian answer is given by Daniel De Leon, this country's master Socialist, in an analysis of how a false Socialist acted. A basic part of the answer is that a real Socialist would not use his office to advocate reforms of capitalism. He would use it as a rostrum from which to attract the attention of the workers of the land, and from which he would show that capitalism cannot be reformed so that it will operate on behalf of the workers. He would demonstrate the imperative necessity for the elimination of capitalism, and the need for a Socialist reconstruction of society.

112 pages, 35 cents

The New York Labor News Co., publishing agency of the Socialist Labor Party, publishes equally sound Marxist literature on various aspects of the social problem. Send for a free catalogue.

**NEW YORK LABOR NEWS CO.,**  
61 Cliff St., New York 38, N.Y.

We have moved to:  
P.O. Box 218  
Mtn. View, CA 94042-0218

**A Socialist in Congress:  
His Conduct and Responsibilities**

*"Parliamentary Idiocy"*

vs.

*Marxian Socialism*

By  
**DANIEL DE LEON**

**We have moved.**

We have moved to:  
P.O. Box 218  
Mtn. View, CA 94042-0218

1963

**NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY**  
61 Cliff St., New York 38, N.Y.



## PREFACE

This pamphlet is based upon editorials written by Daniel De Leon, April to October, 1911, as analyses of the actions and votes of Victor L. Berger, of Wisconsin, who was elected to Congress on the ticket of the so-called Socialist party, now virtually defunct.

The pamphlet was originally titled "Berger's Hit and Misses." But, as Berger was soon forgotten, the original title lost meaning. On the other hand, De Leon's analyses actually gained in importance as more and more people asked what would a *real* Socialist do in Congress. Accordingly, the pamphlet's title was changed to "Revolutionary Socialism in U.S. Congress" in 1931. But this title, too, proved unsatisfactory as it seemed to give the subject matter a negative, rather than a positive, quality. To bring out the positive character of De Leon's analyses, the pamphlet has now been re-titled "A Socialist in Congress: His Conduct and Responsibilities."

De Leon's famous editorials on the charlatan Berger fully live up to the pamphlet's new title. These editorials were in themselves an outstanding example of how a Socialist should conduct himself, as De Leon said, if he has the opportunity "to address the people of the land from the elevated rostrum of Congress." Berger, as De Leon proved time and time again, used the rostrum of his position in Congress to advance reforms that would leave capitalism untouched, and that would mislead the

First printing, May 1912; second printing, February 1917; third printing, May 1919; fourth printing, March 1931.

Fifth Printing, December 1962

Printed in the United States of America.

workers into believing that capitalism can be changed for the better. Berger also used his rostrum to spread misinformation about the meaning of both capitalism and Socialism. These were Berger's "misses" — his spreading of misinformation, and his offering of nostrums that were later picked up as props for capitalism by the "New Deal", "Fair Deal", "New Frontier" Administrations of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy, and that were accepted as necessary by the Republican Administration of President Eisenhower. His one "hit," credited to him by "stretching a point," was his proposed amendment to permit the U.S. Constitution to be amended more simply and directly so that reactionary interests could not hold back the majority will of the people.

Like all of De Leon's editorials, those published here deserve serious study. The fact that Democratic and Republican Presidents and legislators have replaced Victor L. Berger, the false Socialist, as advocates of chimerical reforms adds to the value of De Leon's analyses. Indeed, this fact proves to the hilt the points he made. False Socialists such as Victor L. Berger performed capitalism's spade work. A *real* Socialist, Daniel De Leon, exposed that work as socially evil while demonstrating the socially good (educational) work that can be done from a rostrum that has the attention of the people, and from which the workers of the land may be roused to action.

December 18, 1962.

THE PUBLISHERS

## INDEX.

	PAGE
Socialism on the Political Field.....	3
Amending the Constitution.....	4
Jeffersonianism .....	7
Labor and Savings.....	9
Wages Here and Abroad.....	14
The Secret of Briand.....	17
The "Source of Higher Wages" .....	20
Bourgeois Soul of Pure and Simple Socialism.....	21
The "Message" of Bergerism.....	24
Who Are the Savings Banks' Depositors?.....	31
The Single Tax.....	37
History a la Capitalism.....	42
Reincarnation of Toryism.....	44
Free Trader Labor Lovers.....	46
The Measure of Protection.....	48
The Right to Trade Where, How and When One Pleases	52
Capitalism and Laws.....	55
Yards of Cloth and Yards of Law.....	58
Old Age Pension.....	61
The Lap-Dog Bill.....	65
Soldiers' Pension .....	68
Social Jungle Conditions.....	70
A Contrast .....	73
The "Common People".....	76
The Political State on the Rocks.....	80
Internationality of the Social Question.....	85
Initiative, Referendum, Recall.....	87
The "People's Wealth".....	91
Political False Mathematics.....	94
The Sire of the Trust.....	97
John Warwick Daniel.....	99



BERGER'S MISS NO. 1.

[DAILY PEOPLE, April 11, 1911]

### **Socialism on the Political Field**

Page 6 of the Congressional Record, which records the transactions of the called session of Congress on its opening day, the 4th of this month, records miss No. 1 of Victor L. Berger in Congress.

It is there entered that, the roll call by States of the members of the House of Representatives being completed, and the Clerk having called for nominations for a Speaker, Representative Albert S. Burleson of Texas nominated, in the name of the Democratic caucus, the Hon. Champ Clark; and Representative Frank D. Currier of New Hampshire, in the name of the Republican caucus, nominated the Hon. James R. Mann, whereupon the Clerk having asked: "Are there any other nominations?" and hearing none, the House proceeded to vote viva voce for a Speaker. On the same page the names of the Representatives are entered alphabetically as they answered to their names, the names of all appearing on the roll—the 220 who voted for Champ Clark, the 131 who voted for Mann, the 16 bolting Republican Insurgents who voted for Cooper, the 1 bolting Insurgent who voted for Norris, and Berger, who abstained from voting on the Speakership.

This was a miss on the part of "the first Socialist Congressman."

Whatever dissentient opinion Socialists, here and else-



## BERGER'S MISSES.

where, may entertain for the Socialism of Berger, it is a recognized member of the International Socialist Family; and his election to the parliament of the United States, by whatever methods achieved, was conducted under the banner of SOCIALISM. Under these circumstances, Socialism, the world over, looks, in a broad, however broad the sense, upon Berger as its sole representative in Congress. As such it behooved him, when the Clerk asked: "Are there any other nominations?" to have risen in his seat, and, in the most sonorous voice he could muster up, say: "In the name of the American division of the International Socialist Movement, I place in nomination the Representative from the Fifth Congress District of the State of Wisconsin—Victor L. Berger"; and, when his name was reached in the roll, boldly, self-possessed, cast his vote for Victor L. Berger for Speaker.

The Socialist Movement lets no post go by default. It contends for, conscious that it will capture all.

## BERGER'S MISS NO. 2.

[DAIRY PEOPLE, April 20, 1911]

**Amending the Constitution**

The first act done by the House of Representatives of the Congress now in session was the passing on the 13th of this month of a joint resolution providing for a constitutional amendment to elect Senators by a popular vote. Considering the persistence and loudness of the popular call for the measure, and the more than probability of the Senate, as now constituted, at last concurring, the act was important. In a way it marked an epoch.

## AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION.

In view hereof, the question suggests itself, What share did Victor L. Berger take in the event? The answer will not lie in Berger's mouth that the move was a mere reform, unworthy of his notice. For one thing, "reform" is Berger's forte; for another, although the immediate results of the move are purely reformatory, the move is a sign of the times, and, as such, it offered an opportunity to address the people of the land from the elevated rostrum of Congress upon matters not at all reformatory, and which many an utterance, let drop by the Republican and Democratic speakers, gave a strong handle to.

In the course of the debate—hardly any of the speakers objecting to the move, and most of even those who voted in the negative applauding "the principle" of the amendment—the changes were wrung and re-wrung upon the reason for the amendment, to wit, the ever more frequent scandals that convulse State Legislatures at the election of a Federal Senator. The handle was thus actually thrust into Berger's hand. It was his cue to rise and say:

"Mr. Speaker—On all sides it has been admitted on this floor to-day that State Legislatures have failed in their duty; they have been charged with 'sullyng the fair names of States'; they have been shown to have encompassed 'an evil'; they have been accused, and justly so, of not having been 'responsive to the public will'; they have been rebuked for 'shameful and disgraceful practises';—all of this in the exercise of one of their functions, the election of a United States Senator. Bodies that disgrace the fair name of their constituents, that are guilty of shameful and disgraceful practises, that close their ears to the voice of the people—bodies guilty of such misconduct in the



exercise of any one, can not be guiltless in the exercise of any other of their several functions. The whole International Socialist Movement hails your present move. It hails the move as a step forced upon Political Government by the approaching Social Revolution—a step that is the precursor of a series of other steps—a series that shall close not until the last step is taken, stripping Legislatures of their last functions, in short, the abolition of the Political State, to make room for Industrial Government. To-day's move on your part is a nail driven into the coffin of the last of the series of Political Governments—the Capitalist State. Gladly do I add the hammer blow of my vote to the driving in of this nail,—not because my blow is necessary, but because mine is the only blow, which, being consciously administered, rings in the Industrial Republic; is the first tocsin sounded in this hall announcing its approach.”

Did Berger seize the handle thrust into his hand? Not in the least. On the contrary. The first sound he emitted was after the debate closed, when the vote was being taken upon a double-faced amendment, transparently offered to defeat the resolution, and which the introducer of the resolution scathingly characterized as proceeding from one

“With smooth dissimulation skilled, to grace

A devil's purpose with an angel's face.”

Berger voted for that amendment, and, only upon its defeat, for the resolution itself.

The Daily People anxiously awaits the moment when it may initiate a different series, with an article entitled “Berger's Hit No. 1.” To-day we regret to have to record Berger's miss No. 2.

## BERGER'S HIT NO. 1.

[Daily People, May 14, 1911]

## Jeffersonianism

It may be “stretching a point”—we are willing to do so in behalf of the “first Socialist Congressman”—to record as a “hit” Victor L. Berger's proposed constitutional amendment on the procedure for amending the Constitution.

The “Congressional Record” of the transactions of Congress on the 19th of last month enters the resolution for the proposed amendment as follows:

“Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) providing for an amendment to the constitution of the United States,” and the “*Volkszeitung*” of the next day amplifies the Record by quoting the proposed amendment in full as follows: “Congress shall by majority vote of both Houses have the power to call a convention to revise and amend the constitution.”

In other words, instead of the present round about, and almost prohibitive procedure of Congress proposing amendments subject to the ratification of three-fourths of the Legislatures or conventions of the several states, and the original proposal of Congress requiring a two-thirds majority in Congress itself,—instead of all that Congress shall, by simple majority, be empowered to call a national convention with power to amend the Constitution.

While Berger's amendment falls materially short of the ideal that is bound to be eventually reached, and which the genius of Thomas Jefferson projected more than a hundred years ago, nevertheless the proposed amendment



is switched on the right Jeffersonian track, and is, moreover, in the spirit of industrial evolution.

Jefferson argued against the snobishness of one generation presuming to bind the hands of a future generation. He branded as wrongful the principle whereby it is made hard for a future generation to undo the work which a previous generation did with less effort. Jefferson applied the principle to the amendment of constitutions. Each generation, he maintained, should be at a par with any previous one in the matter of deciding upon its own organic laws. Furthermore, drawing in a breath from an Age far in advance of his own, the breath of Socialism, holding that a free people must be an alert people, Jefferson advanced the theory that the consent of any generation to the organic laws that rule it should not be a passive, but an active consent. Accordingly, Jefferson promulgated the principle that constitutions should expire at stated and not very distant dates, and should then be either expressly re-enacted if the people like, or re-modeled, as they may prefer.

We wish to credit Berger's proposed amendment with the Jeffersonian spirit. We wish to credit it with the intent of being a deliberate step in the direction of genuine freedom under the self-imposed restraints that civilized society demands.

Furthermore, Berger's proposed amendment is in line with industrial evolution.

The present required ratification, of three-fourths of the Legislatures or of conventions of the several States savors, on the political, of the backwardness of Craft Unionism on the economic field. It savors of the moss-back autonomous

individualism that fetters man, preventing him from developing the capabilities of his species. What Craft Unions are in this country, the several States have become. The injury that Craft Unionism now is to the Working Class, distinct Statehood is, to-day, to the citizen. As Craft Unionism was the shell within which Industrial Unionism had to develop, so was distinct Statehood the shell within which the National Chick was to be hatched. Finally, just as, on the industrial field, the one-time myriad sacrosanct Craft Unions are on all hands cracking and tending, how-ever gropingly, to transform into one Industrial body, so is the day bound to come when the forty-and-odd Statehood varieties are to merge into one.

Whether Berger's proposed amendment—the wiping out of separate State ratifications, and providing for one National Constitutional Convention with power to amend—is or is not consciously responsive to the Socialist trend of the times that demands the wiping out of Craft and the instituting of Industrial Unionism—however that may be, we gladly credit him with the purpose of intentionally rendering the Constitution more readily responsive to the progressive sentiments of our people.

Let this go as Berger's hit No. 1.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 3.

[DAILY PEOPLE, May 16, 1911]

### Labor and Savings

On last April 28, the Republican Congressman J. Hampton Moore of Philadelphia occupied the floor in the delivery of an extensive speech against the Farmers' Free List bill.



The speech was of the regulation Republican high tariff style. In regulation Republican fashion the gentleman stood forth against Free Trade on the ground of its "baneful effects" upon the "wage earners." It is a part of all such harangues to picture the prosperity of the wage earners which Free Trade menaces, and would utterly destroy. That part was not failing in Mr. Moore's speech. It was a conspicuous feature thereof.

By the half hour—Mr. Moore must have spoken longer than three hours—proof was produced, statistical and otherwise, of the affluence now enjoyed by the wage earners under the Republican Administration. Among the proofs, Mr. Moore cited his own city of Philadelphia and, more particularly, the Savings Fund Society of Philadelphia which receives "no more than \$500 from any one depositor in any one year"; which, he added, now rejoiced in "more than 276,000" depositors, "the owners of \$111,000,000"; and in which number of depositors, he stated, "wage earners predominate." To back up his statements, Mr. Moore read from "a table showing the occupations of the depositors who opened accounts with the society during 1910"; and he rattled on at this rate till his voice gave out, and he "inserted without reading," a long list of capitalist concerns, in the bonds of which funds of the Saving Fund Society are extensively invested, and from which bonds a shower of prosperity redounds to the preponderating number of wage earner depositors in the shape of interest—all in demonstration of the wage earners' present prosperity.

At this point Victor L. Berger should have broken in for a question. Such an act would not have been disor-

derly. It would have been strictly in keeping with parliamentary usage in both Houses of Congress.

There is hardly a speech made in Congress but is interrupted with many a question. The Speaker, or whoever is at the time acting as presiding officer, usually asks whether the gentleman from So and So, naming the State from which the member who has the floor hails, will yield for a question to the gentleman from So and So, naming the State from which the member who wishes to ask the question is accredited. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the gentleman from So and So who has the floor courteously yields for a question. It was the cue of the "first Socialist Congressman" to say:

"I should esteem it a favor if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will enlighten the House, and myself in particular, upon the figures that he quotes. He has produced a tabulated statement officially issued by the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, giving the *occupations* of last year's depositors, these being 46,340 in number, and 15,836 thereof wage earners, male and female. The tabulated statement omits, however, to indicate the *amount* of deposits that these wage earners have to their credit. I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania to give me the figures under that head. Neither the number of wage earner depositors, nor the statement that \$500 is the maximum that any one depositor is allowed to deposit in any one year, give any indication as to the *amount* that these wage earners have to their credit, hence as to the degree of prosperity that they enjoy. The gross figures that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has recited from memory on the present status of depositors and deposits in the said Saving Fund Society—



276,000 depositors, and \$111,000,000 deposits, without specification of the amount owned by wage earners,—leave me still worse in the dark, upon the points that I wish to be enlightened on, than the official figures for last year which he read off. The gentleman from Pennsylvania states that 'wage earners predominate' in the 276,000 present depositors. Even if the 'predomination' be a predomination of only 1, it would follow that there are this year 138,001 wage earner depositors—a phenomenal increase of at least 122,165 wage earners, or nearly nine times as many as last year, giving them a preponderance that they did not then have, and all that during the last sixteen months, fully six of which have elapsed since the overthrow of the Republican party at the polls, aggravated, from the gentleman's standpoint, by the still more prosperity-subversive event of the election of a Socialist to this house over the head of a previous Republican incumbent. I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would explain this sudden and phenomenal rush of wage earners to the Saving Fund Society, and specify the share they own in that \$111,000,000 gross deposit.

"If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will indulge me just a minute longer, I would like to add to this question a further elucidation that will enable him to explain the point completely, as it bears directly upon the prosperity of the wage earner, resulting to him through his savings bank deposits. It is argued that the deposits of the wage earner, so far from benefiting, do him positive injury. The average wages of the wage earner in Philadelphia are, according to the latest figures obtainable (1905), \$546.52—a figure too small from which to make 'savings.' If, from

so small a wage, the worker does make any 'savings,' the amount though trifling, in each individual instance, will, in the aggregate, amount to something. The amount, say, of savings by the at least 138,001 workers, who, according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, constitute the preponderating class of depositors in the Saving Fund Society of his city, would be a figure of respectable proportions. That amount, or any considerable portion thereof is not available to anyone of the said wage earner depositors—they lack collaterals for raising loans from the Saving Fund Society. The aggregate deposits are, however, accessible to capitalists. These deposits are frequently borrowed by capitalists to 'improve' their plant with improved and, therefore, labor-displacing machinery. Hence, it is argued, that the wage earner depositor, who pinches himself against a rainy day, and also in order to increase his income, does, in fact, hasten the arrival of the rainy day, and throw himself out of work. His mite towards the aggregate deposits of his class, it is argued, returns to him in the shape of a privately owned machine that knocks the bread out of his own mouth. From which it would follow that the larger the share of the Philadelphia wage earner depositors in that \$111,000,000 with the Saving Fund Society, by all the thinner thread would their prosperity be hanging. I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania to explain these points."

It does not matter what answer "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" would flounder over. The question could be put, the bolt shot in less than four minutes. It would be a message, delivered under the resounding board of Congress, that would reverberate into the shacks and the tene-



ment pigeon-holes where the workers of the land are huddled: it would enlighten them: wipe away many a certain cobweb that now stuffs their mind, and mightily contribute towards the realization of Socialism—all of which, in the interest of the emancipation of the Working Class, is a tip herewith suggested to the "first Socialist Congressman."

THAT a "lone Socialist" CAN do—and vastly more valuable would that be than, in Congress, to keep silent, and, out of Congress, deliver speeches on what one Socialist CAN NOT do.

#### BERGER'S MISS No. 4.

[DAILY PEOPLE, May 25, 1911]

### Wages Here and Abroad

The House of Representatives being in Committee of the Whole on the Farmers' Free List bill, Representative James M. Graham of Illinois delivered on May 3rd a lengthy speech that one should think was expressly intended to set up a series of clean targets, challenging Socialist bolts—so many were the opportunities which the speech held out to Victor L. Berger to "interpellate," in strict parliamentary form and conformity with the usages of the House. Berger missed them all. In successive articles we shall treat the leading "misses" on that occasion.

For instance—

Tackling the false reasoning that Protectionists delight to indulge in of comparing the higher (money) wages paid in America with the lower ones paid in European countries, and imputing the more favorable American (money) wages to Protection, Mr. Graham said: "How ridiculously absurd,

to compare wages and conditions in two countries, when the population is twenty times as dense in one as in the other and competition proportionally keen."

This statement, made by a Free Trade, or Low Tariff man, who was all along claiming a lower tariff was in the interest of the workingman, was a bugle call to bring the Socialist to his feet with the request—"Will the gentleman yield?" Representative Sims of Tennessee, who was at the time officiating as chairman, would have asked: "Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?" The gentleman from Illinois would certainly have yielded; he yielded repeatedly to others; it is the "courtesy of the House." Whereupon Berger could have scored the following inning for sound, for Socialist, for Labor political economy:

"The gentleman's reasoning to the effect that a bare comparison of American wages with wages in other countries is an absurdity, in so far as the comparison is intended to argue in favor of Protection, is cogent. As the gentleman correctly stated, other factors have to be considered. Among the determining factors cited by the gentleman was the factor of 'competition' among the workers for jobs. In other words, the condition of the Labor-Market. This, of course, means that, where and when the supply in the market is in excess of the demand, Labor will fetch a proportionally lower price, that is, wage. This is a recognition of sociologic fact that, within the frame work of the present, or capitalist system of production, the price of Labor is determined—like the price of cattle, of bales of hay, of hairpins, in short, of all other merchandise,—by the supply of and the demand for the same in the market. And, fin-



ally, this is the consequent admission of the further sociologic fact that, within the capitalist system, the status of the workingman is economically, neither better nor worse than that of an article of merchandise. Now, then, keeping in mind this pregnant social and economic fact, pointedly indicated by the gentleman of Illinois himself, I would request him to explain to me, to this House, and, through this House, to the wage earners of the land—for whom he expresses such admirable solicitude, and for the benefit of whose wages he so fervently advocates a lower tariff—I would request him to explain by what process of economic, or any other, reasoning the low tariff or free trade man can make out that a lower tariff can redound to the benefit of the wage earner, of the wage slaves, to put it plainly. Seeing, as the gentleman correctly indicated, that wages, the price of Labor, depend upon the supply in the Labor Market, hence, that where the supply is high wages will be low—seeing that, by what process of reasoning does the law of supply and demand in the Labor Market cease to be operative under Free Trade, or a lower tariff. Does it not rather follow that, high tariff, or low tariff, or no tariff, wages depend upon the supply of and the demand for the merchandise workingman—hence, that the tariff issue is of no economic interest whatever to the working class?”

While other Congressmen freely availed themselves of the usages of the House and interrupted Representative Graham with questions in the interest of the specific capitalist interests that they are the watchdogs of in Congress, the “first Socialist Congressman,” supposedly the representative of the Working Class, to the tune of \$7,500 a year for two years, was away from his post, making grand-

stand speeches outside, to justify his impotence inside of Congress—and missed the opportunity.

[DAVY PEOPLE, May 31, 1911]

### The Secret of Briand

“Twas Thursday, April 27.—The bill under consideration by the House, in Committee of the Whole, was on the apportionment of Representatives in Congress. David J. Lewis of Maryland had the floor.

The gentleman, young in years, was still younger in point of Congressional experience. He started by saying so himself, and proved it by the college boy matter that he delivered, and the manner in which he delivered it. He ignored the bill under consideration and read a lecture to Congress on comparative parliamentary practice, giving, in regular political science seminary student's fashion, the palm to European nations for superior parliamentary methods. So dry was the delivery, so crude the treatment, that, so far, this was the only speech not accentuated throughout with applause by one side or the other of the House. Nevertheless this speech enjoys the distinction of being the only one that united the two factions of capitalist politicians. The solitary applause which it evoked is recorded not as the applause is usually recorded—“on the Democratic side”; or, “on the Republican side”—but simply “Loud applause,” which means applause on both sides.

What was the point scored by the new member of Maryland, to provoke such a demonstration?

Mr. Lewis had been explaining the European system of



dividing parliament by lots into large "deliberative divisions," and arguing the superiority of the system over that which obtained in Congress. As "a characteristic illustration" of the operation of the European system in affording all the Members, "without regard to whether they are new Members or old," the opportunity to display their capabilities, the gentleman cited the "instance of a very distinguished man of France," who, as every Member belongs to some section and is free to participate in the consideration of every measure referred to it, showed his surpassing eminence from step to step, first with regard to a notable measure before his own section, next in the central section, next "as the man selected to steer the measure through the turbulent House of Deputies of France," until "he was next heard of throughout the world as Briand, the prime minister of France, although belonging to an extremely minor party, with very radical feelings and opinions, and in a country that respects property as much as we do here."

This was the climax that unified the warring clans of capitalist politicians in "loud applause"—and that was the psychologic moment for a Socialist to break in with, "Will the gentleman yield for a question?" Probably the presiding officer would not have needed to ask the gentlemen from Maryland whether he yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin. In all probability the gentleman from Maryland, cockish and cocksure, would have anticipated the presiding officer with a courteous: "I do, with pleasure," whereupon Berger should have proceeded:

"Is not the gentleman from Maryland attaching prime importance to an immaterial, and overlooking the essential cause in the case? Is not the cause of Briand's elevation to

be found in the double circumstance of France being so stirred by the breath of the Socialist Revolution that the capitalist class of the country felt desperate, and, in its desperation, did what ruling classes often do in such conjunctures—throw a tub to entertain the whale; and in the further circumstance of Briand's being an Anarchist, not a Socialist, that is, just the kind of a tub from which was expected that it would gratify the Revolution and yet betray it, as Briand did? Does the gentleman from Maryland fail to catch the note of the identical strategy in this country, notwithstanding there is not here in vogue the parliamentary system which he praises so highly? How does the gentleman account, for instance, for the recent establishment of a Department of Commerce and LABOR, and the same being placed in the hands of some plutocrat or other? Or does the gentleman fail to detect the physiology of Briand in the multitude of 'labor-leaders,' pets of the National Civic Federation, who are elevated into political jobs by our powers that be? In short, is not the parliamentary system under which a Briand was elevated, merely a matter of form, the essence being the purpose of leading the electric spark of the Revolution into the ground?"

The "loud applause," that united the Republican and Democratic Representatives upon the bestowal of praises upon Briand by the "gentleman from Maryland," would have been X-rayed by such a question, interpolated by the "gentleman from Wisconsin," and the flash would have illumined many a dark corner in the land, to the clearing up of the path for Social Emancipation. But—as hitherto—the "first Socialist in Congress" "muffed the ball."



## The "Source of Higher Wages"

Representative Sydney Anderson, high tariff man from Minnesota, had the floor on Thursday, April 20.

The speech that the gentleman delivered on the occasion bore the earmarks of careful preparation. Figures in abundance, citations from previous Republican Presidents and other authorities were marshalled in solid columns against the proposed Canadian Reciprocity bill as disastrous to the Nation, and a bill calculated to draw the working class into the vortex of calamity.

The burden of the speaker's argument was that the farmer is the center from which and whom prosperity, or adversity, radiated, and that the bill would make havoc with prosperity from prosperity's starting point.

In order to illustrate his point, Representative Anderson said:

"It might be pertinent to inquire in this connection where it is that the prosperity expert gets his facts. Does he go to the factory and inquire what men are employed, and at what wages? No. He goes out to the farm and learns that the crops are well put in, that the weather conditions are good, that there is no prospect of drought, that the chinich bugs have not devastated the crop, and he comes back and makes the report, and the factory owner increases his product, raises the wages of his men 5 per cent., and adds 20 per cent. to the price of his goods, because he knows that this year the farmer will have the money to buy a new pair of felt boots, a new overcoat, build a new hog house, and buy his wife a new spring bonnet."

Instantly the voice of Victor L. Berger should have been

heard:—

"Will the gentleman yield one brief minute? The point he has just made regarding the genesis of a rise in wages is so pregnant, and, so far as I know, so novel, that it should not be impaired by lack of explanation and proof. I would like the gentleman from Minnesota to cite at least one instance of wages being raised voluntarily by the manufacturer, and as a consequence of good crops. So far as I know, wages, that is, the price paid by the purchaser of labor power, are raised voluntarily by the employer not any more than any other purchaser voluntarily offers a higher price for the article that he purchases. So far as I know, and the manufacturers in this House will bear me out, wages are not, surely not habitually, raised but upon the demand of the workers, backed by an actual, or the prospect of a good, healthy crop of strikes."

Had the "first Socialist Congressman" put in this "lick," and not once more "missed stays," then the estimate he recently gave out himself to the effect that he was not considered a joke, but was "taken seriously" by Congress, would be an inspiring reality, instead of being the roaring thing that the statement actually is.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 7.

[DAUX PEOPLE, June 14, 1911]

## Bourgeois Soul of Pure and Simple Socialism

The several Trust investigations that have been conducted by House Committees of this special session of the 62nd Congress were initiated through a resolution,



Resolution 157, introduced in the House on May 9 by Representative Robert L. Henry of Texas, Chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The resolution provided for the election of a committee of nine members to inquire into the doings of the American Sugar Refining Company, better known as the Sugar Trust. While the powers of the Committee were broad, specific channels of investigation were pointed out to its attention—the relations of the Trust with other concerns engaged in the same business; the effect of the Trust's conduct upon competition; its effect upon the price of sugar.

The "first and lone Socialist in Congress" labors under the disadvantage that, in order to make a set speech, he must obtain "time" from either of the two—the Democratic or the Republican—"time" controllers during the debate on any motion. But the disadvantage is theoretical, only. Making ample allowance for the practical effect of the theoretic difficulty, a SOCIALIST, that is, a Member of mental and moral fiber will find no unremovable difficulty to assert his right to "voice," as he exercises his right to "vote," on any matter before the House. De La Matyr, the Greenback Member from Indiana during the days of Greenback agitation, though a "lone" Member, had his say, whenever he wanted. Moreover, as has been repeatedly pointed out in these columns, the parliamentary usage of the House, as well as of the Senate, gives ample scope for a Member, however "lone," to be heard—provided, of course, he has "anything to say," and the bravery, born of knowledge and integrity of conviction, to say what he has to say.

Resolution 157 being before the House, and the debate on foot, it was the duty of a Socialist Member, all the more imperatively if he is a "lone" one, to move to amend:—

"And the said Committee shall also inquire into the general conditions of work that prevail in the plants of the American Sugar Refining Co. and the various corporations controlled thereby, as follows:

"First. As to the hours of work;

"Second. As to the wages received by each employe—not the 'average wage';

"Third. As to the sanitary conditions of the shops and yards;

"Fourth. As to the number of accidents, and the nature, and the cause thereof;

"Fifth. As to the violations of Factory Acts committed by the said company and companies."

It would not have been necessary to back up the amendment with arguments. Each sentence in the amendment would have been an argument in itself, and notice to the galley slaves chained by Poverty to the benches of the Sugar Trust galley, that their day of deliverance had actually dawned. Would the Speaker have ruled out the amendment? So much the worse for him.

But there was no amendment to be ruled out. The notice that their Cause was being attended to, in other words, that Socialism had really broken into the Halls of Congress, was not given to the wretched Sugar Trust proletariat, and, through them, to the rest of the wage slave class. The silence—from the only quarter that should have aught to say of interest to the wage slave,—was, on



the contrary, a notice, a gloomy notice, a heartbreaking notice that the Exploiter still rules the roost, undisputed, in his political burg—that, not a “lone Socialist,” but a “regulation politician” occupies the seat of the 5th Congress District of Wisconsin, more intent upon securing the Speaker’s automobile for the comfort of his own District of Columbia Committee, than upon issues that affect the comfort and the prospects of the proletariat.

### BERGER'S MISS NO. 8.

[DAILY PEOPLE, June 22, 1911]

## The “Message” of Bergerism

Keeping in mind that Victor L. Berger did not speak, but read, the speech which he delivered in the House, sitting on June 14 in Committee of the Whole on the tariff on wool; also considering that, although the speech was read, it was withheld a full day, and not published until the Record for the following session;—in short, considering that the speech was written down before delivery, and was, after delivery, polished up, the conclusion is justified that the effort was Mr. Berger’s best, and expected by him to be worthy of the occasion—the debut of Socialism on the floor of Congress.

Fain would we, a second time, stretch a point in favor of Mr. Berger, and record his “Second Hit,” as a relief to the scandal of the long procession of “Misses” that the gentleman has so far scored in Congress. It can not be done. The performance of June 14 is the sorriest “Miss” of all, down to that date.

In attempted justification for having left unchallenged any of the innumerable, to the Working Class, pernicious

economic and sociologic tenets which, down to June, were being daily reeled off in Congress by both Democrats and Republicans, Mr. Berger authorized the statement that he was not there to convert capitalist Congressmen. For the conversion, for the instruction of whom were such utterances prepared, written down in advance, and carefully looked over after delivery, as these, for instance:

“I want it understood that there is no such thing as protection to labor in any tariff bill.”

“You are continually making laws for the protection of life and property—for the protection of the lives of those who own the property, and for the protection of the property they own.”

“No matter whether we have a high tariff or free trade, competition has a tendency to weed out the economically weaker concerns.”

“Business men are always patriotic when there is profit in sight.”

“The manufacturers palm off their private issues as national issues.”

“In the steel mills of Pittsburg, Chicago and Milwaukee, where 30 years ago the so-called princes of labor used to get from \$10 to \$15 a day, the modern white coolies get \$1.75 for twelve hours a day, seven days in the week—having no time to praise the Lord, and no reason either.”

“Free trade is no panacea.”

“It [labor] has protected itself by strikes and boycotts, which have been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to be illegal.”

“Our so-called free workers are sometimes worse off—



## BERGER'S MISSES.

from the purely economic point of view—than the blacks were under slavery before the war.”

“The employer who can fleece and skin his workmen best is best equipped for the fight in the open market.”

“For the poor people the times are always hard.”

“Various remedies have been proposed. Single tax, more silver dollars, greenbacks, and a dozen other remedies have been offered. But since none of them does away with the deadly effects of competition, and with the effect of the machine on the workman, I must dismiss them as insufficient.”

“As long as these implements of production—land, machinery, raw materials, railroads and telegraphs—remain private property, only comparatively few can be the sole owners and masters thereof.”

“The workingman’s labor has become a mere ware in the market.”

“The yarn, the cloth, the metal articles which now come out of the factory are the joint product of the many people through whose hands they had to go successively before being ready. No single person can say of them: ‘This I have made.’ Yet these social tools and social products are treated in the same way as they were at the time when the tool was an individual tool, and when the product was created by the individual.”

These sentences are types. They are fair specimens from Mr. Berger’s maiden speech. From them the whole of the June 14 effort may be judged.

What sustained argument does such a speech contain to prove WHY Socialism—the Industrial Republic on the

## THE “MESSAGE OF BERGERISM.”

ruins of the Political State—is THE solution, the ONLY solution, the logical solution?

With the exception of the two passages quoted last—disconnected, dislocated, fragmentary in part falsely quoted, and obviously misunderstood chips of Socialist philosophy, timidly pushed forward, like the spooks that timidly advance from the medium’s cabinet—the speech is of the tribe that has been heard in the country, off and on, for the last fifty years, from all manner of Discontents.

Mr. Berger declared he had “a message to deliver.” Was this a Message, the Socialist Message? But for Mr. Berger’s saying he was a Socialist, the “message” is hard to distinguish from that which is being delivered from the platform of the Single Tax; of Prohibitionism; of Greenback and Free Coinage; of the Roman Catholic political hierarchy, whence, quoting the encyclical of Leo XI, the distress of the workers is specified, and the cruelty of the rich condemned; or from the platform of Anarchy;—in short, from the political platforms of all Movements that are, either the breath of Sentimentality, or the bourgeois class-ignorance, if not denial, of economic and sociologic Fact.

The re-assertion of distress (even Democrats and Insurgent Republicans are indulging the sport)—that merely is not, can not be the Message that the occasion calls for—the stomach of the proletarian and otherwise public mind has been stuffed to repletion with such indigestible mental food. Bald, unsubstantiated, undemonstrated assertions, defectively cribbed from Socialist literature—neither that can honor the bill that the Age is pressing for collection. WHY—the allegations contained in the speech being



true—Why is Socialism, and not Single Taxism, Prohibitionism, nor yet Protection or Free Trade, tariffs, high or low, or any other political scheme the solution? The failure of all of these is no proof of the assured success of Socialism. WHY did, and were all of these, doomed to fail? WHY is Socialism the correct answer to the modern social Sphinx? THAT was the Message expected; yet, of that not a word worth the while.

Not a word in demonstration of the stupendous sociologic fact that the Capitalist System condemns the proletariat to the status of goods, wares and merchandise—a casual assertion only.

Not a word about the imperious economic Law that decreases the death of the small producer, all factitious legislation in opposition notwithstanding—not a word in demonstration of the pregnant economic fact.

Not a word about the smallness of the wealth now actually in existence, together with its insufficiency to afford a civilized existence to all, despite the modern potentiality of affluence for all, with excessive toil for none—not a word in demonstration and explanation of the tell-tale phenomenon.

Not a word about the juridic-economic Law according to which the tenure of possession of the necessities for production is bound to be adapted to the method of using the same; hence, that the method of production now having again become collective, the tenure of possession of the necessities therefor the march of Civilization orders must likewise become collective—not a word in demonstration of that great ethnic fact—only a clumsy and confused utterance regarding the same.

Not a word to guard against the quagmire of Sentimentality—not a word of warning, and proof that suffering is classless, differing only in degree, not in kind—on the contrary, words without end promotive of the common delusion.

Not a word regarding INTERESTS—not a word in demonstration of the illuminating Sociologic fact that it is INTERESTS that bear the class impress, and that it is CLASS INTERESTS that carve the history of the race, its Past, its Present, and its Future—not a word. Not a word to clarify the field by drawing sharp and clear the Class Struggle of to-day—not a word.

Not a word, accordingly, not an argument to enable the Wage-Slave Class to bowl down the preachments of the pack of politicians, professors and pulpiteers, along with their capitalist press, whose function it is to fill the air with false and conflicting and confusing reasoning.

Not a word about any of these Facts and Laws, big with Revolution—Facts and Laws which explain the present social unrest, disorder and turmoil, which marshal the Nation the path that it must tread, and which point imperatively to Socialism and Socialism alone as the goal—not a word.

Of all that, not a word; in other words, not a word of the Message that the hour is thundering for.

That Message, true enough, is difficult to understand. It requires close attention; close reasoning. Nevertheless, the hard conditions of the times have turned the stomach of the Working Class against the windy declamations of yore, and dieted them with a taste for solid mental food. Not since the closing of the Civil War, when the Social



Question first raised its head throughout the length and breadth of the land, have the toilers been in a mood to hear the Message of Socialism as they were on June 14, when "the first and only Socialist in Congress" rose for the first time in his seat to address them, as they hoped, in the Nation's capital, from the Nation's capitol. They were hungry to hear. It was a psychologic moment such as the Nation's proletariat had never before experienced. The moment was lost. The Message remained undelivered. Instead of stilling the hungry ear of the revolutionary class of the land, "the first Socialist in Congress" put at ease the apprehensive mind of his bourgeois fellow Congressmen—and made himself solid with them. Our proletariat craved for LIGHT—light to light their path for their own independent thinking—they were given, instead, a dark lantern.

For two months, since the entrance in Congress of "the first Socialist" there, expectation had been agog. As day passed upon day, and week upon week, and the second month upon the first, with the silence unbroken from his seat—despite the numerous challenges couched in repeated anti-Socialist utterances on the floor from his bourgeois colleagues—many there were, we among them, who borrowed consolation from the thought that Mr. Berger was a German. As such we hoped he would eventually make good the German proverb to the effect that what takes long in the making will finally be good. What he did was to make good the English proverb: "Tis your addled egg that takes long hatching."

When the hour granted to Victor L. Berger expired, and his maiden speech was delivered—then, while the bourgeois

Representatives crowded around him with sincerely glad handshakes—the Genius of Socialism, who, up to the last minute, had hovered around him, dropped her head in sorrow, and took flight from his side.

#### BERGER'S MISS NO. 9.

[DAILY PEOPLE, June 28, 1911]

### Who Are the Savings Banks' Depositors?

If ever a man himself put his own head "in chancery" it was Representative Julius Kahn of California when, Victor L. Berger having delivered his maiden speech on June 14, he started to interrogate him. If ever a man had another's head "in chancery" it was Berger on that occasion.

Kahn was the first to start the shower of questions, and he did so in cross-questioning style, which Berger met courteously. In the course of the cross-questioning, Kahn's purpose being to refute Berger's claims regarding the declining well-being of the workingman, the Representative from California said:

"I know in my city of San Francisco the savings banks have deposits of \$159,000,000, which are the savings of the working people of that community."

Here was a head "in chancery"—the head of the capitalist maker of the statement, above all, the head of the brazenly false statement itself.

The claim, set forth by the labor-skinning bourgeois, that the millions and billions in the savings banks of the land are the "savings of the working people," has many a time and oft been demonstrated false in these columns. The demonstration has been made with the official figures



of the Departments. Socialist Labor Party literature has demolished the claim. Neither in San Francisco nor anywhere else are the deposits in the savings banks "savings of the working people."

As to Representative Kahn's own San Francisco—

Representative Kahn gave the figures for the total deposits in the savings banks of that city. He abstained from stating the number of depositors. Without the figures on the latter head, the statement concerning the \$159,000,000 deposits in the 'Frisco savings banks being "the savings of the working people of that community" can not be tested. We are, however, not left dependent upon the Representative's omission. The number of depositors in the savings banks of 'Frisco can be obtained with sufficient approximation elsewhere.

The latest report of the Comptroller of Currency gives the total deposits in the savings banks of the State of California as \$334,965,870.34. Representative Kahn's figures for 'Frisco are \$159,000,000. Accepting Mr. Kahn's figures as correct, it follows that the savings banks of San Francisco hold 47 per cent. of the total deposits in the State.—Stick a pin there.

The Comptroller of the Currency also gives the total of depositors in the savings banks of California. The figure is 420,172. Seeing that the deposits in the savings banks of 'Frisco are 47 per cent. of the total savings deposited in the State, the assumption is fair that the same ratio holds good with regard to the number of depositors. Forty-seven per cent. of 420,172 gives to 'Frisco 197,480 depositors.—Stick a pin there also.

There is a third item needed—the number of wage

earners at present employed in the mechanical and industrial occupations of San Francisco. The exact figures on this head are not accessible. Census Bulletin 101 for 1905 places the figure, that year, at 44,875. Stretching every point in favor of Representative Kahn, we shall accept the number to have since increased to 50,000.—Stick a pin there.

And now combine the three premises.

The conclusion is that, even if every single one of these 50,000 wage earners—men, women and children—even if every mother's son and daughter of the lot were a depositor in the savings banks of their community (a thing that not even so venturesome an individual as Representative Julius Kahn would venture to claim)—even then there would be 147,480 depositors, or nearly three times as many, who are not wage earners.

The final conclusion is obvious:

If, out of 197,480 depositors in 'Frisco, only about one-third are wage earners, then the total deposits can not be "the savings of the working people of that community." The share of that \$159,000,000 that falls to the working people shrinks to about one-third—even supposing the unsupposable that everyone of the 50,000 wage earners were, indeed, a depositor.

When the scrutiny is carried on deeper and from still other sides, the fact is revealed that the day when savings banks were the banks of the poor is gone by. But the revelation from the above scrutiny is sufficient unto the day to demolish Representative Kahn's false figures. As in 'Frisco, so everywhere else. As everywhere else, so in



'Frisco, the amount deposited in savings banks by wage earners is a negligible quantity.

It can be expected of Mr. Berger, no more than of anybody else, that he should have been posted, on the spot, and in precise detail, upon these figures. True. What, however, could be expected of the "first Socialist in Congress," nay, demanded, was that he should have been found posted upon the principle in the case, upon the general facts and figures, and also upon the experience that the capitalist class and its mouthpieces—lay and clerical, political, professorial and pulpiterial—the moment their false pretenses concerning high wages to the wage earners in mills, factories, shops and mines and on railroads, in short in all the productive and distributive occupations, are refuted, presto, take refuge behind the mists of savings in the savings banks. It is a sort of scuttle fish trick, by which individual low wages, and consequent poverty, is expected to be blurred by an alleged hugeness of collective earnings, and consequent affluence.

Berger had the floor when the San Franciscan, Berger having yielded to him for a question, made the brazen assertion regarding the \$159,000,000 deposits in the San Francisco savings banks being "the savings of the working people of that community." It was for "the first Socialist in Congress" to turn on the spot the tables upon the ranting bourgeois politician with two questions in rapid succession:—

"What is the number of depositors in your San Francisco savings banks?"

Mr. Kahn, who introduced his assertion with "I know," who, accordingly, spoke as "one who knew," can hardly

have tried to dodge the question. Had he tried to do so, instinctively scenting where he was to land, then the falseness of his reasoning would have needed no further demonstration, and Berger could have dismissed him and his statement in disgrace. More likely, Mr. Kahn would have answered the question with substantial accuracy. The second question should then have followed instantaneously:—"And what is the number of the wage earners in 'Frisco, employed in mechanical and industrial occupations?"

The second question would have clinched the first.

If again Representative Kahn had given the figures with substantial accuracy, then the fact would stand revealed that, even if all the 50,000 wage earners of 'Frisco were among the 197,480 depositors the by far larger portion of the \$159,000,000 would not be the property of the working people.

If, however, Representative Kahn, by this time perceiving the hole he had got himself in, became rattled, he would have done one of two things:

Either, timidly lowered the figure of wage earners below the actual number—in which case the consequence would have been to increase still more the already by far larger portion of the \$159,000,000 which the wage earners do not own.

Or, grown desperately reckless, desperately increased the figure of wage earners above the actual number—in which case, inversely, Mr. Kahn would still have exhibited a larger portion of the \$159,000,000 as belonging to others than the working people.

In any and all cases, the fact stands out clear as a pike:—contrary to Representative Kahn's assertion, the \$159,-



000,000 in the savings banks of San Francisco are not "the savings of the working people of that community." The overwhelming majority of them are kept down by capitalism with nothing to "save" from. Whatever shoot the bourgeois podsnap Julius Kahn had elected to take, he would have found himself in the plight of a toad nailed to a barn door—at the mercy of Berger—the head of his mischievous falsehood staved in, in plain view of the bourgeois whom the falsehood is intended to back up, and of the proletariat for whom the falsehood is intended as dust in the eyes.

The hare, in hunter's parlance, having run up the legs of the Socialist hunter; the contestant having, in boxers' parlance, run his head into chancery with the Socialist boxer;—did the "first Socialist in Congress" turn to account the providentially tendered opportunity? He did exactly the opposite.

Upon Representative Kahn's preposterous assertion that he "knew" in his own city of San Francisco "the savings banks have deposits of \$159,000,000, *which are the savings of the working people of that community*," Berger's immediately following answer was—"Yes." And the shameful "Yes" is no wise mitigated by the rest of the sentence—"and I know that you have had more strikes and more hell in San Francisco than in any other city I know of except Chicago."

The "Yes" was in contradiction to the statistics in Berger's speech showing a decline of wages. That "Yes" was tantamount to a retraction of his assertions regarding the lowering status of the Working Class. If the proletariat of San Francisco can be possessors of \$159,000,000

of savings, then the "strikes" and "hell" in that city differ not in kind from the "hell" that capitalists raise against capitalists, the fraternal swine-rend-swine "hell" in the capitalist brotherhood in which, it is the capitalist contention, Brother Labor has his place beside his Brother Capital.

To the shame of the Socialist Movement, "the first and only Socialist" in Congress made an unconditional surrender to capitalist theory, capitalist false figures, and capitalist falser reasoning, when victory and the utter annihilation of all these was in his power.

#### BERGER'S MISS NO. 10.

[DAILY PEOPLE, July 4, 1911]

### The Single Tax

On June 10 the Single Tax was on exhibition in the House.

In justice to Representative Henry George, Jr., from New York, it must be said that it was none of his fault the exhibition was not complete. He did his part well. The exhibition fell short of perfection due to Victor L. Berger's wholly failing in his part.

So far as Henry George, Jr., was concerned, the speech he delivered on that day unveiled the leading beauty-spots of Single-Taxism. Nothing worth mentioning, on that head, was withheld from the spectators:—

Single Tax duplicity was exhibited in the claim that the Single Tax did not—"propose to change titles"—as tho' the landlord was a title-lord—as tho' what moved the landlord was the theoretic enjoyment of title to, and not the material rental yield of the land—as though the "land



values," so called, being taxed away from, there was anything worth keeping left to the landlord. Single Tax duplicity, hence conscious weakness, was well exhibited.

Single Tax comical economics came out strong in the statement that "value proceeds not only from labor, but from a power to exact labor"—like saying that a race horse's speed proceeds not only from the horse's sinews and muscles, but from the whip in the hand of the jockey on his back.

Single Tax patent-medicine-drummer's characteristics stood out in bold relief in the lengthy passages about wonderful progress made by the Single Tax in far away lands—just as drummers of quack nostrums declaim of wonderful cures effected there and yonder, everywhere—except in the place where the drummer happens to be holding forth.

Single Tax half-truth was displayed in the instancing of the raising of the tax on land in many localities as evidences of Single-Taxism—as though the periodical raising of the tax on land were not a well known fiscal move, disconnected from and free of all Single Tax sociologic pretensions.

Single Tax shallowness leaped to sight in the belief that the howls of the British feudal lords at the Lloyd-George budget—the immediate effect of which is the re-valuation of land which now "stood valued as it was in the days when the Norman William crossed the channel and took the crown from the Saxon Harold"—was an evidence of Single Tax up-to-dateness in social demands, whereas what the howls do demonstrate is the Socialist tenet to the effect that the Single Tax is a sociologic back-number, a weapon borrowed from the arsenal of the French bourgeois, re-

sorted to by him when, in the days of his revolution, he fought to overthrow his feudal masters and to subject the proletariat to himself.

To the exhibition of all these and kindred Single Tax features, such as Recklessness and Sweepiness of statement, as also Cocksureness, Representative Henry George, Jr., attended to to perfection, himself. When he was through the Single Tax stood out, well defined, as one of the plants spoken of in the Bible that spring up rank because they have no deepness of earth.

It was thereupon the cue, it was the duty, of Representative Victor L. Berger to put the finishing touch to the picture, so far drawn so well. That finishing touch could have been put with one short question. Nor would there have been any difficulty to put the same, seeing that Mr. George, Jr., was the pink of courtesy towards questioners, in fact, panted after questions. The question would have been:

"The Single Tax claims, as its central virtue, that it will render access to land, that is, to natural opportunities, equal to all. In what way will the land become more accessible to the proletariat, the class that has nothing to work with but its finger nails?"

Many a lovable man and woman there are in the Single Tax. To them no offense is meant by saying that the above question invariably transforms the Single Tax into a rat in a trap when the lid has clicked fast.

Endavoring to escape, the Single Tax rat rushes in one direction, and bumps its nose against the bar of the principle of political economy to the effect that, between Man and Nature (Land or Natural Opportunities), there has



risen a Social creature, the Machinery of Production, with which Land becomes accessible, without which Land remains inaccessible.

His nose being bumped against that bar, the Single Tax rat scurries in the opposite direction, only to thump his nose against another bar—the principle of sociology to the effect that, the Machinery of Production being private property, that is, Capital, the proletariat can exercise its labor functions only with the consent of the private owners of the said Machinery, that is, of the Capitalist Class, and that the consent is not granted but upon condition that the proletariat sell itself into wage slavery.

Thumped against that second bar the Single Tax rat ricochets with his nose in some other direction only again to go smack against another bar—the bar of another economic principle to the effect that, even if, under capitalism, access be allowed to broader areas of land, such is, on the one hand, the concentration of economic power now at the capitalist's command, and, on the other hand, the hugeness of the unemployed, that conditions will remain practically unimproved for these, and the status of wage slavery unchanged.

A third time jolted against a bar of the trap he is in, the Single Tax rat will dart elsewhere, only to dash his nose against still another bar, the bar of economic logic, a bar into which not the slightest dent can be effected, the logic according to which, upon the same principle that if, of two wolves which were in the habit of sharing between them the lamb they jointly caught, one is killed off, the surviving wolf will not content himself with half a lamb: he will devour the whole lamb himself. To-day the hide of the

proletariat is shared between Capitalist and Landlord. Suppress the Landlord wolf, and the Capitalist wolf will appropriate the whole proletarian hide.

Furious at the bump his nose receives at this last bar, the Single Tax rat will plunge with a bang against still another bar, the philologic bar which, through the modern term "land poor," brings home to him the fact that things have wholly changed since the archaic times when "white parsons and elephants mad with pride" were the fruits of a deed of land.

And so our Single Tax rat will make the rounds of the bars of the cage in which the above stated question confines him. With increasing rage will he bump himself from bar to bar. Until, at last, demented, and his nose all swollen and bloody, he will sit, as at bay, on his haunches, show his teeth, and, grinding them, spit out:

"Socialist!"

"Tyranny!"

"I don't want the State to dictate to me what color of handkerchief I shall blow my nose in!"

By failing to put to Representative Henry George, Jr., the question—"In what way will the land become more accessible to the proletariat under the Single Tax?"—the "first and only Socialist" in Congress fell blameworthy short of his duty to exhibit the Single Tax bourgeois anachronism upon the stage and with the settings of Congress; expose it in all the fullness of its features; show it off in the completeness of its image; and unveil it in its tell-tale form and pressure.



## BERGER'S MISS NO. 11.

[DAUX PEOPLE, July 12, 1911]

**History a la Capitalism**

Presumably in silent admiration, so far as the Congressional Record gives any token, the House granted on May 17 the request of Representative James L. Slayden of Texas to have inserted in the Record the address which he delivered nearly a fortnight previous before the Third National Peace Congress, at Baltimore.

The address bore upon the relations of the United States to other American Governments and upon the Monroe Doctrine. Some few portions of it are a correct historic presentation of ancient history; altogether, the address was cast in a mold to deceive, to perpetuate popular superstitions that are harmful to the working class, to confirm popular errors that conceal the misconduct of Congress and the Administration, and to promote popular delusions to the end of giving a free hand to the bourgeoisie for its policy of foreign rapine, as now threatened against Hayti, in alliance with monarchic governments.

The address slurred over the fact that the monarchic Governments of Europe were speedily reconciled to the idea of a republic in America, not out of fear for the then young and weak United States, but because the Kings of Europe, together with their Noble pursuivants, took note of the rapidly cumulating evidences that a republic need not necessarily be a guarantor against privilege. The evidence of a Ruling Class, swinging here into the saddle, satisfied the Crowns and Nobles of Europe that they needed not fear for "the evil effects," or the example of republican

America among their subjects and vassals at home; on the contrary, they could count upon the Ruling Class of America as a new ally.—The language of the address was intended to cultivate the, to the workers, harmful superstition that "kingship" means tyranny, "republicanism" freedom.

The address is worded in a manner to conceal the fact of our war against Spain having had for its moving spring the intrigues of stockjobbers and Trust land-grabbers. It conceals the fact in volumes of denunciations of "stock-jobbers" and moneylenders' wars" while seeking to throw the mantle of international law over the fishy transactions and scandal of the Bermudez Asphalt Syndicate through the United States legation in Venezuela.

The address strikes the posture of righteousness and affects to believe peace possible between the Nations of America through the command "love thy neighbor as thyself," thereby evading the glaring fact of the itch for war on the part of our soldiers of fortune, obedient to the itch of our American capitalists for rapine in Latin America.

The purpose of printing in the Congressional Record such a series of matter poisonous to enlightenment, especially in these days of popular effervescence, is transparently obvious. If objection is raised, nothing that is not said in the House can appear in the Record. In this instance the usage of the House makes, and justly so, one Member a majority. There was no objection raised. With the tacit consent of Victor L. Berger, whose objection would have been enough to keep the poison out, in went the poison.



## BERGER'S MISS NO. 12.

[Daily People, July 16, 1911]

**Reincarnation of Toryism**

Of all polite Members of the House, Representative Frank B. Willis of Ohio is easily foremost. His is the politeness of the politician; aware of the changes of fortune; careful not to make an enemy; with a smile and a smirk for foe and friend; knowing what he wants and pursuing his interests, or obedient to his instructions, yet ever professing "great respect and admiration" for the adversaries whose interests he knows are as sordid as his own.

Mr. Willis gave an exhibition of his imperturbable and honied politeness on the 18th of May, when the bill to admit New Mexico and Arizona to statehood was called up, and he led the debate on the Republican side, holding the floor for over an hour. As Mr. Willis himself said of his speech, it was "colloquy" rather than a speech—so many were the interruptions for questions to which he cheerfully yielded, the questioners being themselves frequently interrupted by other questioners, without objection on Mr. Willis's part. He said he enjoyed it.

Mr. Willis was firmly set against the recall of the judiciary clause in the constitution of Arizona. He raised no objection to the recall of any other officer. The recall of the judges he objected to. He said:

"I believe it will make a weak judiciary when a man sitting on the bench, instead of considering the law and the facts, is put in the position where he has to find out what is being said about this proposition in the corner groceries and at the pink teas all over the country." The

issue, according to Mr. Willis, was whether the Judges were to be "independent and free to apply the law," or whether they were to be "the mere creatures of the passing gusts of public opinion."

Surely there was no danger of so polite and yielding a Congressman, as the gentleman from Ohio, refusing Victor L. Berger the opportunity of asking:

"Was not there, about 120 years ago, an element in this country who held language like this:

"I believe it will make a weak legislature when men sitting in the Nation's parliament, instead of considering the law and the facts, are put in the position where they have to find out what is being said of a proposition before them in the corner groceries and the pink teas all over the country. The question is whether the legislators are to be free and independent to enact the laws, or whether they are to be mere creatures of the passing gusts of public opinion. Nor, dangerous as that is, is it as dangerous an experiment as the creation of an Executive, subject to impeachment by such a dependent Legislature, and himself, instead of independently and hereditarily, and, consequently, unremovable, considering the laws and facts that would redound to the people's welfare, put in the position where he has to find out what is being said in the corner groceries and at the pink teas all over the country, a mere creature of the passing gusts of public opinion."

"And what did such language then, and its echo to-day import but fear of the people?"

Did the "first Socialist Congressman," the reputed representative of the crowning revolution of all social revolutions, the revolution that is pre-eminent **THE**



PEOPLES—did he voice the sentiments of THE PEOPLE on the occasion of the snobbish language used against it by the slick, the oily-tongued, the all-men's-friend Ohio politician? No, Mr. Berger once more illustrated the fact, quite naively, though unintentionally confessed by himself of his nullity in Congress.

#### BERGER'S MISS NO. 13.

[DAILY PEOPLE, July 18, 1911]

### Free Trader Labor Lovers

Although he introduced his remarks, in the speech that he delivered on April 28 in favor of free trade, with the words that he spoke "as a farmer, one among the few farmers" in the House, Representative James C Cantrill of Kentucky struck the attitude of a special guardian of the workingman.

It was in the interest not of the farmer only, that Cantrill demanded the abolition of the tariff, so that "with free sewing machines the farmers' wives can sew up our protection friends, the standpaters, in free burlap and salt them away with free salt to keep until the final day of judgment."

It was in the interest, not of the farmer only that, with wit unexcelled even by the French free trade wit Bastiat, Cantrill demolished the radically false economic theory of protectionists known as the "balance of trade," according to which the larger the volume of goods exported by a country in comparison with its imports, all the wealthier that country is—it was in the interest not of the farmer only that Cantrill exposed to ridicule that ridiculous theory

with the observation that "if a freezing tramp should sell his clothes, he certainly would improve his balance of trade, although not his condition."

No, the Kentucky Representative used his keen dialects, and exhausted his oratorical powers in the interest of the workingman as well, whose burdens free trade was to lighten, whose wages free trade was to raise, whose right to organize free trade was to promote and insure.

Nor did the free trade Kentuckian indulge in such generalities only. His solicitude for the laboring man led him to observations that blasted many a false reasoning of the industrial capitalist who systematically seeks to identify the condition of his employes with his own—as, for instance, when our Kentucky farmer free trader remarked that "it would not interest the men described in the Pittsburgh Survey, who are worked to death and thrown on the junk pile, to figure out and to ascertain how many wives per annum a Pittsburgh millionaire could afford out of the dividends of the Steel Trust"; or when he let drop the weighty statistical observation that "there would be little satisfaction to a cash girl working for the Marshall Field Co. at a weekly wage of \$3 to know that she and that corporation were jointly worth over \$50,000,000."

Obviously the free trader Cantrill was a consummate hypocrite of the regulation property-holding stamp, or an egregious ignoramus on the economics that concern his dearly beloved "laboring men."

For what reason did not Victor L. Berger, "the first and only Socialist Congressman," turn to account, in the interest of the Working Class, at least one of the numerous blanks offered in this speech by asking "the gentleman



from Kentucky" in what way free trade could benefit the laboring man? in other words, in what way would, or could, free trade affect beneficially the status that both free trade and protection capitalism condemn the workingman to—the status of merchandise, bought and sold in the labor-market? again, in other words, in what way would or could free trade overthrow, or at least counteract the market law, the law which "the gentleman of Kentucky" himself reverently bowed to as "the natural law of supply and demand," according to which the price (wages) paid for labor-power is bound to tend downward? In short, in what way does free trade differ from protection, in so far as the workingman's wages are concerned, seeing that free trade, identically with protection, allows the workingman to preserve only so much of the fruits of his labor as the supply and demand for his hide will fetch in the market?

For what reason did not "the first and only Socialist Congressman" avail himself of the usages of the House to put any of these clarifying questions, and thereby voice the class interest of the class whose class interests Socialism voices? Why did Berger miss this choice opportunity also? Why?—Why, he was absent "on important business," the business of self-exhibition.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 14.

[DAILY PEOPLE, July 22, 1911]

### The Measure of Protection

There is in the House of Representatives a "gentleman from Connecticut" with whom "accuracy", "preciseness", "facts and figures" are a specialty. The gentleman from Connecticut has been nicknamed by one of his colleagues "Mr. Danbury Hats" from the circumstance that his

district takes in the hat town of Danbury, and he, more than once, approved himself the watchdog of Danbury hat manufacturers. The gentleman's name is Ebenezer J. Hill. From these introductory remarks it will have been perceived that Mr. Hill is a Republican—a protectionist Republican—a high tariff man.

On May 4 Mr. Hill broke the Democratic party on the wheel of his facts and figures. Maintaining that the Payne-Aldrich tariff was a revision downward; reminding his Democratic colleagues that they had been howling throughout the country against the Payne-Aldrich tariff as "revision upward"; and holding up to them more recent documents, issued by their own Ways and Means Committee, from the statistical tables of which it appeared that the Payne-Aldrich tariff was revision downward; Mr. Hill climaxed this part of his argument saying:

"Are we, as Republicans, not entitled to retraction of all statements heretofore made about upward revision and repudiated pledges?"

Had Mr. Hill stopped then and there, the gentleman would have given himself no blank for a Socialist bolt. The Socialist can have applause only for every Republican politician who nails the duplicity of the Democrats, the same as he has applause only for every Democratic politician when they nail their Republican competitors. But Mr. Hill did not stop then and there. Obedient to the fatality that pursues the Republican as well as the Democrat, the gentleman from Connecticut had to go further.

Having tied the Democrats fast to the stake, so fast as to be justified in demanding of them a retraction, Mr. Hill proceeded to elucidate, and thereby endeavor to justify the



Republican's pretense of his high tariff's being for the protection of American labor. Not once, but twice, Mr. Hill proclaimed with admiration the Republican tariff theory to be the equalization of wages between this and competing countries, "the measure of protection" being "the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad."

This was the Socialist's opportunity, in turn, to tie fast to the stake the Republican Representative.

The difference of COST, meaning, of course, wages, between this and competing countries, is and can be no criterion. If German workman John Doe, receives \$1 a day, and American workman Richard Roe receives for a work day of the same length \$2 a day, it does not follow that Richard is better paid than John. A number of things, things that the statistician, the man of "facts and figures," is wide awake to, come into consideration. These things fall under two heads:—

Under the first head comes the consideration of the "cost of living"—\$1 in one country may go as far as, if not further than, \$2 in another. The importance of this fact is known all about by the Republican "gold bugs," who, fifteen years ago, correctly argued against the "free coinage" craze, showing that an increase of wages, through an increase of coins called "dollars," would by no means signify an increase, and might even signify a decrease, in the goods, or necessities purchased thereby—2 50-cent "dollars" had no higher purchasing power than 1 100-cent dollar.

Under the second head of things to consider is the productivity of labor here and in competing countries. If German workman John Doe receives \$1 a day for mak-

ing two pairs of, say, \$1 shoes, and American workman Richard Roe receives, say, \$2 a day for turning out, say, 10 pairs of shoes, it would be equivalent to saying that the German receives back  $\frac{1}{2}$  his product while the American receives back only 1-10, and is the worse paid of the two, the more extensively plucked.

The detailed facts that fall under these two heads being rather involved; moreover, seeing it would take too long to recite them from market and other reports; the Socialist in Congress would simply allude to them curiously, as the theoretical preparation in his process for tying up the "labor protecting" Republican. More effectively than by reciting the details under these two heads, he would proceed to tie up Mr. Hill by reciting certain facts that flow from, prove and illustrate the economic theories pointed out.

The Socialist would mention the large number of protected articles of American manufacture sold abroad, in competing and in non-competing countries, at a lower price than they are sold here—hats (the product of Mr. Danbury Hat's) our own special pets; locomotives; Waltham Watches; boots and shoes; bicycles; sporting goods; textiles; firearms; boilers; kitchen ware; etc.; etc.

This list overthrows all pretense of the tariff being intended to equalize wages between this and competing countries for the protection of American labor. The recitation of this list could have been done easily. The denial of its correctness would be as impracticable a flying in the face of facts, as would have been the denial, by Mr. Hill's Democratic colleagues, of the facts that he marshalled against their veracity. It was the duty of Victor L. Berger, a duty



he owed to the proletariat of the land, to have requested Mr. Hill to yield; stated these reasonings and facts; and, following the example of "the gentleman from Connecticut," asked:

"Are not the workers of the United States entitled to an apology for the oft repeated incorrectness of this talk about the tariff being intended for their protection as an equalizer of wages between the 'highly paid' and the 'pauper labor' of other countries?"

Berger would have had no difficulty in inducing "the gentleman from Connecticut" to yield to "the gentleman from Wisconsin." For one thing, "the gentleman from Connecticut" is the pink of tolerant courtesy; for another, the interest shown by the House in his speech was so slight that he himself observed there were "more people in the galleries than on the floor": gladly would he have seen the occasion enlivened by a question from the "first Socialist in Congress." It was not so. "The first Socialist in Congress" remained mum—or was he equally delinquently absent from his post?

BERGER'S MISS NO. 15.

[DAILY PEOPLE, July 25, 1911]

## The Right to Trade Where, How and When One Pleases

"We care nothing for the freedom of the foreign manufacturer that the present law interferes with or restrains, but we do care for the restraint that the present law imposes against the exercise of the inherent and what ought to be inalienable right of every American citizen to trade where, and when, and how he pleases"—such was the key-

note sentence in the long speech delivered on June 8 against the wool schedule, Schedule K, by Representative William G. Brantley from Georgia, who throughout the speech posed as the paladin of Freedom, Labor's Freedom specifically.

The key-note passage occurred during the first hour of Mr. Brantley's speech, before his time was extended indefinitely. During that first hour the Republican Representatives must have sat like "baked owls," speechless at the onslaught upon them. Not one dared to interject a question, or ask the gentleman from Georgia to "yield." The speech was throughout accentuated by "Applause from the Democratic side," and by "Loud applause."

Surely Victor L. Berger, "the first Socialist in Congress" did not figure among the galaxy of "baked owls"? Surely he, being the "lone," the only Socialist in Congress, felt the full responsibility that rested on his shoulders when that brazenly untrue key-note—brazenly untrue with regard to the Working Class—was sounded? Surely he promptly rose and, requesting the gentleman from Georgia to yield, asked:

"If it is the inherent right of every American citizen to trade 'where, and when, and how he pleases,' then there must be some statutory enactment that suspends the exercise of this right by the Working Class. The gentleman from Georgia declares that the exercise of this right is interfered with by the high tariff of Schedule K in certain quarters. Seeing that 'trade' does not mean to 'buy' only but to 'sell' also; seeing that the workingman can not sell his merchandise, labor-power, 'where, and when, and how he pleases'; and seeing that Schedule K can, obviously, not



be held responsible for the infringement, with regard to the workingman, of that important factor in 'trade,' to wit, to sell;—seeing all this, I would request the gentleman from Georgia to inform us by what process of reasoning the clipping of Schedule K will restore to the wage earners of the land that right, which, though called by him 'inherent' the worker is deprived of—the right to sell 'where, and when, and how HE PLEASES.'

'I lay emphasis upon the 'pleases.' The gentleman from Georgia is too much of a scholar to fail to realize that, tho' the workingman may withdraw from one employer, and carry his merchandise, labor-power, to another, he does not therefore sell 'where, and when, and how he pleases'—

"The wage earner has no choice as to 'where'—he is compelled to go wherever it may please the employer to set up his plant—if it please the employer to remove his factory to another city or State, the wage earner's home is broken up and he must expatriate himself whither the employer may please, with the alternative to starve.—There is no 'pleases' as to the 'where.'

"The wage earner has nothing to say as to the 'when.' Whenever the employer, in his private judgment, thinks it is well to shut down his plant, the wage earner has to try to sell anew. Whenever the employer chooses to reopen, the wage earner has a market.—There is no 'pleases' as to the 'when.'

"Least of all has the wage earner to say 'how' he will sell. The price of his merchandise depends upon supply and demand in the labor market. Differently from all other sellers he can not curb the supply; differently from all other commodities, the supply of or demand for the

merchandise labor power lies wholly in the hands of the buyer. It is the capitalist class that alone can and does control the supply and demand of labor-power. The wage earner must, in the long run, sell how the capitalist class wishes, and that is the same as to say that a change of master, or buyer, is no change to the workingman.

"Accordingly, in capitalist society the workingman can not sell 'where he pleases,' he can not sell 'when he pleases,' he can not sell 'how he pleases.'

"This being thus, in what manner would the clipping, or even the killing of Schedule K, restore to Labor its 'inherent right' to sell 'where, and when, and how it pleases' no long as capitalism abides?

"Will the gentleman from Georgia make that clear?"

Did, we asked above, Mr. Berger figure on the occasion among the galaxy of baked owls in the House? Of course he did—unless he was still more derelict to duty by being wholly absent from his post.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 16.

[DAIRY PEOPLE, July 29, 1911]

### Capitalism and Laws

Representative Julius Kahn from California takes rank in Congress among the most redoubtable champions of "stable government," of "American institutions," and of "true democracy." As such, the "radical" and "anarchistic" proposed constitution of Nevada gave the gentleman an opportunity that it was not in him to let slip—the opportunity to inveigh against "dangerous and doubtful experiments." And he did so, on May 18, in style and manner of shallow inveighers generally—with the bombastic phrases of a Bombastus Furiosus.



One of the phrases that Mr. Kahn used was: "Too much law will lead eventually to contempt for all law." Mr. Kahn liked this phrase so well that he inserted it at the head of his speech. Indeed, the gentleman chose well. None of the phrases which he used typified his speech so well as—"too much law will lead eventually to contempt for all law."

"Too much law," under capitalism?

"Laws," as the term is understood in class-rule, especially in capitalist society, are generally provisions for the protection of one interest against another. Capitalism, being a social system of strife, is, by the very principle of its own existence, a sort of umpire at a boxing match. It must regulate the manner of the strife: specify admissible blows and "fouls": decree the conditions for the former, and the conditions that determine the latter. A glance at books of law under capitalism brings conviction upon the strife nature of capitalist society. Laws are enacted, not only on matters that affect "business." The Law enters into the privacy of the family and illumines the strife that capitalism raises there—laws on "husband and wife," on "parent and child," on "guardian and ward," etc., etc., as well as laws on "corporations," on "banking," on "contracts."

Besides being a system of strife, therefore, a system that demands Laws; capitalism is a system of continuous differentiation. The Spencerian description of the march of evolution from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous is a definition that fits capitalist society. The infinite differentiations, or developments from homogeneous interests to

heterogeneous, works an added call upon capitalist society, for more, and more, and still more laws.

Laws, ever more laws, and still more laws is a "law" of capitalist existence.

Accordingly, to talk of "too much law," as the rambunctious pillar of capitalist society, Representative Julius Kahn, of California, does, is downright treason to his own "flag." The capitalist building can not have too many props. Its interests are too many and too antagonistic, and they are too increasingly numerous and too increasingly antagonistic to miss a single law, and not to need an ever larger number of 'em.

Nevertheless, Mr. Kahn's motto to the effect that "too much law will lead eventually to contempt of all law" is a truth—a truth, however, of the sort that danger often wrings from instinct.

It is not alone in the matter of raising the proletariat that capitalism raises its own future conquerors; it is not alone in the matter of organizing production integrally that capitalism abolishes itself. In short, it is not in such matters only that capitalism digs its own grave. Capitalism provides for its own annihilation by bringing contempt upon its own political State. And that it achieves thanks to that law of its existence, a law which it fain would escape, but a law which, joined to others, decrees its doom—the law that compels it to whelm itself with Laws and thereby fatedly turns these, its props, to contempt.

In the instance of Mr. Kahn, Mr. Victor L. Berger must not be blamed for not having requested "the gentleman from California" to yield, and, with a concise, terse observation, ripped up in the course of the Californian's



speech, the false sociology that the country was being treated to. No, Mr. Berger must not be blamed for not having done so then and there. Mr. Kahn seems to have committed his speech to memory, and he prudently twice declined to yield to others in the course of the delivery. Interruption in such cases often plays bad tricks upon memory. Mr. Kahn announced, however, his readiness to "answer all questions when I have concluded my speech." This was an express invitation. Nor was the invitation left unaccepted. Four Representatives fell in at the end, and Mr. Kahn yielded courteously to each in succession. The "first Socialist in Congress" was, however, not among the four, as it was his duty to have been.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 17.

[DAILY PEOPLE, August 2, 1911]

## Yards of Cloth and Yards of Law

An insult—calm, cold, deliberate, cruel and brazen—was offered to the working class of the land, in general, the cotton mill operators of the South, in particular, by Representative James F. Byrnes of South Carolina from the floor of the House of Representatives.

Answering the attack of the Pennsylvania Republican, Benjamin K. Focht, upon industrial conditions in the South, Representative Byrnes said: "In comparison with the salary and mileage of the gentleman from Pennsylvania the operatives [cotton mill operatives of the South] are poorly paid, but for the class of work demanded of them their wages are fair."

"Will the gentleman allow a question?" was due from the seat occupied by a Socialist member of the House the instant the gentleman from South Carolina had closed his

much applauded peroration. Whereupon the question should have followed clip and clear:

"What does the gentleman mean by 'the class of work' demanded of the cotton mill operatives of the South, and for what reason does he consider the wages, which he admits are 'poor' in comparison with the salary and mileage of a Representative to this House, to be 'fair'? A Representative receives \$7,500 besides mileage, not to mention other perquisites; the operative in the Southern cotton mills receives, according to the latest (1905) available figures, \$4.68 a week. What are the services rendered, or goods produced by the two? The Representative turns out yards of laws. What the quality is of this commodity may be judged from the expressions that have dropped plentifully from the lips of the gentleman's own fellow Democrats, to the effect that the masses of the country have been legislated into poverty, and from his own lips in the short rattling speech that he has just delivered, when he quoted the summary of the situation by a citizen of Ohio, showing that nearly \$1,000,000 a day or 67½ per cent. of all Government expenses was incurred for war purposes, the figures in detail given by him being: "For education, 3 per cent. and for agriculture 1¼ per cent.; for feed, \$1; for fight, \$37; for brains, \$1; for bullets, \$22; to encourage production, \$1; to encourage idleness, \$37; to shoot brains in, \$1; to shoot brains out, \$22; for culture, refinement and education, \$1; for shotgun business in time of peace, \$22." On the other hand, the cotton mill operative turns out yards of cotton goods. The usefulness of this output need not be enlarged upon. Comparing the two outputs—yards of laws and yards of cotton goods—



they stand to each other in the relation of shoddy to genuine products. If the pittance paid to the producer of useful goods is 'fair wages,' then it should follow that the bountiful salary and mileage paid to the producer of shoddy is wasteful. And vice versa, if the bountiful salary and mileage paid to the producer of shoddy yards of law is legitimate, then, it seems to me, that the producer of useful yards of cotton goods should be remunerated many times more bountifully. I should thank the gentleman from South Carolina if he will explain on this floor the process of reasoning by which he implies disparagement of the 'class of work' that is done by the cotton mill operatives of the South, and admiration for the 'class of work' done in the law mill of the Nation. The explanation, I throw, will be of deep interest, not to the Southern cotton mill operatives only, but to the working class the land over."

The insult offered by Representative Byrnes to the wage slaves of the land remained unresented, unrebuked. The A. F. of L. labor-leaders in Congress applauded with the consent implied by silence, if they did not actually join in the handclapping that greeted Representative Byrnes' speech.

And what about Victor L. Berger? He again missed the opportunity to puncture the class reasoning of the exploiters' class. Representative Byrnes' speech was delivered on May 2. On that day, the "first Socialist Congressman" was illustrating outside of Congress, outside of Washington, how impossible it is for the "ONE Socialist Congressman" to do anything in Congress, seeing that, even when he is at his post, he might as well be thousands of miles away.

## BERGER'S MISS NO. 18.

[Daily People, August 6, 1911]

**Old Age Pension**

On July 31 Victor L. Berger dropped a bill into the basket at the Speaker's desk. The noiselessness of the dropping was made up by the noisiness of the claims that Berger immediately set up for his bill through private interviews.

The bill was, by these means, announced as a "pension bill for the veterans of the industrial war." In its behalf it was, by these same means, argued that the pensioning of soldiers being legitimate, for all the more reason should the "soldiers of industry" be taken care of—many more of these than of the others being maimed and killed on the battlefields of industry, and their services being vastly more valuable to society.

Nor were the high expectations, raised by this correct statement of the exalted posture of Socialism towards the soldiers of industry, left to rest wholly upon the loftiness of the goal. They were raised still higher by the method, which (likewise by the means of private interviews) it was pointed out and enlarged upon with which the bill guarded itself against bourgeois assault. That method was drastic and extreme: it went the full length of extremity and drasticness that the Constitution allows: and it was backed up and justified by a drastic and extreme precedent to match—the act of Congress of March 27, 1868, forbidding the Federal Courts to pass upon the validity of the reconstruction laws which it had enacted after the Civil War. The Berger Pension Bill expressly forbids the exercise of



jurisdiction by any of the Federal Courts upon the validity of the act.

In short, here was a goal set up, than which none more lofty under capitalist rule,—provision for the soldiers of industry, men and women, who, delivering daily battle on the firing line of industry, at the risk of health, limb and even life, physically and mentally feed, clothe and home the Nation. Here was a means, than which none more determinedly manly,—the emulation of Congress in an action taken at that most critical parliamentary crisis in the Nation's existence, when the rebel buffoonery of the then President by accident, Andrew Johnson, and the encouragement that that gave to rebel intriguers, threatened to undo with legal manoeuvres the achievement just sealed at Appomattox.

With such a goal and such a means to match, Expectation soars—but soars only to droop and drop plump down.

First—the pension is to accrue only after the veteran's 60th year.—The average life of the American soldier of industry is barely 40, a fact well known to, and reckoned with by the railroad and other capitalist concerns that force their employees to join the insurance clubs which these concerns set up.

Second—the pension is to be forfeited by a conviction of felony, the disqualification is sweeping. Whatever action a bourgeois Court pronounces felony is to be felony. No distinction between acts of moral turpitude, and honorable, class-conscious acts, which, in a spirit of revenge, the bourgeois Courts stamp felonious and punish as such. Preston, who, under all law "human and divine," asserted his right

to life against a murder-minded and murder-armed bourgeois; Smith, his associate, and for which association alone he was convicted, along with Preston, by a Pinkerton jury; and both of whom are now in a Nevada's felons' cell;—neither of them, and along with them many more of labor's champions, past, present and to come, "need apply."

Third—the pension rolls are closed to him or her who, though 60 years of age, has a weekly income of \$6.—Those rare survivors of close to two generations of unrequited toil, during which they sweated and bled an abundance of wealth into the coffers of the Capitalist Class—those rare survivors, who, perchance, pinched themselves during two generations of toil and whose savings now may yield them the weekly pittance of \$6; or who, more probably, are still on the firing line of industry from which they fetch some crumbs that enable them to hold the prohibitory \$6-yielding property;—they, all of them, are to be left out in the cold.

Fourth—no pension for the orphans of the toilers, male or female, whose occupation has, either indirectly, by undermining their health, or directly, through any of the numerous "accidents" on the firing line of industry, sent them to early graves.

Fifth and last, and, if possible, worst of all—the "lucky" ones (we mean no unseemly joke at the expense of these martyrs of Capitalism on whose backs the Victor L. Bergees have joined the capitalists in "practicing upon the dog"), the "lucky" soldiers of industry who have escaped death before 60, and who can filter through the excluding



provisions of the bill, they are to be remunerated with the bountiful maximum amount of 57 cents and 14 mills a day (\$4 a week), or the minimum amount of 14 cents and 29 mills a day (\$1 a week). Sixty years of toil and poverty that yielded affluence into the coffers of the Capitalist Class are to be rewarded out of those same coffers with the crust of an average 35 cents and 73 mills a day (\$2.50 a week)!

Such a bill, if it came from an outspoken bourgeois, would confirm the Socialist maxim that "Charity is to steal wholesale and return retail." Coming in the name of Socialism, the bill is an insult to Socialism and to the Working Class alike. It is an insolently insulting bunco game of "big boast, and small roast."

Since this special session of Congress began and down to date, the "first and only Socialist in Congress"—with just one exception for which, anxious to stretch a point in his favor, we allowed him credit—has done literally nothing but "miss stays." On June 14, when Mr. Berger, in his first and, so far, only speech, made the lamentable exhibition of Socialism that he made on that day, even to the point, as shown in the 8th article of this series, of speaking about raw materials as "social tools," the hope arose that the gentleman had "touched bottom." The hope was unwarranted. Deeper depth was reached on July 31, when the pension bill was introduced, and the trumpet blown over it by its introducer into reporters' ears.

With the exception of June 14 and July 31, Socialism was exhibited in the House dumb and craven; on June 14 Socialism was exhibited as ignorant; now, on July 31, Socialism was exhibited as shoddy.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 19.  
[DAILY PEOPLE, August 9, 1911]

### The Lap-Dog Bill

To the unsophisticated, there was something mysteriously uncanny in a certain performance that took place on the floor of the House of Representatives in the course of the session of the 12th day of July.

On that day a tariff bill was reported unanimously—aye, unanimously—by the Committee on Ways and Means;—a bill to amend paragraph 500 of the Republican act of August 5, 1909, by allowing the free importation of certain articles not thought of in the said act.

A bill removing the duty collected under a Republican act—such a bill agreed upon, not merely by the Democratic, but also by all the Republican members of the Committee—that, assuredly, was something mysterious, if not uncanny.

The debate that ensued was short, yet was it long enough to clear up the mystery, and turn the uncanniness to drollery.

It developed that a lady, owning a Pomeranian pup, who went to Europe with her pet, and returned with the same, was, upon her arrival here, submitted to the horror of seeing the pup seized for duties. The customs inspector would listen to neither sense nor pleadings. Appealed to by the lady on the score of heart and sentiment, he remained obdurate. Argued with by the fair pup owner that her pet was no merchandise, and had not even been bought abroad, but was born and bought in America, and was taken abroad, and now returned to its own home—the customs officer coldly pointed to paragraph 500 of the act



of 1909 which provided no loophole for the pup to slip through. The lady, possessed, evidently, of political pull, set her wires agoing. The result was magical. The whole machinery of the government was set in motion. The House Committee on Ways and Means was hurriedly convened. The upshot was an amendment to paragraph 500 covering the Pomeranian pup under an all embracing clause for such cases.

The bill became known as the "lap-dog bill." While no Member of the House spoke against it, and the fact was obvious that Republicans and Democrats alike were to concur, the one and the other took occasion to indulge in considerable banter at each other.

On the Democratic side, Representative John J. Fitzgerald of New York led. On the Republican side, strange to say, the sedate old ex-Speaker and Seneca E. Payne, were the fuglemen. The former pooch-pooched at the Republicans for being so ready, they who had been objecting at every step to any amendments of the tariff before the Tariff Board had reported, to vote for this free pup importation. The latter returned the compliment with many satirical shots at the Democratic majority's affection for Pomeranian pups, mongrel and yellow dogs. The Insurgent Norris went further. Amid jokes cracked over the back of the Society for the Protection of Poodle Dogs in the District of Columbia, he aired his democratic, "common people" sentiments by telling the story of how one day, walking down Connecticut Avenue he "saw the door of a residence open—a residence that had cost perhaps a couple of million dollars—and a well-dressed woman came out and there drove up in front of it a carriage with two men

in uniform sitting on the seat in the rear, and as the woman came down the walk those men got down and took off their silk hats and bowed almost to the sidewalk as they opened the carriage door and put her in the carriage. She carried in her arms a beautiful poodle dog, all decked out in ribbons, trinkets and flowers." And he proceeded to say that he watched her as they drove down the avenue, and how his heart bled in pity for this woman's wealth who, he supposed was childless, but that presently the door of that mansion opened again, and a colored woman came out wheeling a baby carriage, and that when he noticed the expensive trinkets and playthings about that baby, he felt sorry for the little baby. And more of this sort of thing.

Finally Representative William Hughes of New Jersey lost all patience. He did not stand upon the formality of time being granted him. He broke in directly with: "Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized for five minutes"; and he was; and brushing aside the banter of the debate as a manifestation of the "silly season" when "the dog days are upon us," he presented the serious aspect of the bill.

Did the "first and only Socialist in Congress" do likewise? If Victor L. Berger is too spineless to demand recognition for five minutes when the subject on the tapis is of a nature to cause the Members' jaws to be set, could he not have mustered up spine enough to demand recognition for two minutes at a time when the nerves of the Republican and Democratic Members were relaxed in mirth? Were the kennel-like accommodations, vouchsafed by the steamers to proletarians coming or returning to America and the treatment they receive on landing, in



contrast with the Asiatic splendor that homing lap-dogs enjoy on the same steamers, and the consideration that this particular Pomeranian pup received from Congress,—were not thoughts thereof prods enough to cause the “only Socialist Congressman” to rise to his feet, demand recognition, and hold the mirror up to the otherwise mutually snarling but now unanimously hilarious bunch of bourgeois politicians? Evidently not. Conspicuous by its absence in the Congressional Record is any entry credited on the occasion to “Mr. Berger.”

#### BERGER'S MISS NO. 20.

[DAILY PEOPLE, August 12, 1911]

#### Soldiers' Pension

A matter entirely foreign to pensions—the appeal of one of the House employes for reinstatement—being wrangled over in the House on May 26, the subject of pensions did somehow intrude itself.

Pensions is a subject matter of many fascinations for our bourgeois Congressmen. To one set the subject affords golden opportunities for Jingo speeches on all that “the country owes to the dauntless defenders of the flag”; to another set the subject is the occasion to look wise and circumspect, to warn against extravagance, and to display much detailed knowledge of Treasury affairs; to still another set the mere word “Pensions” is like the waving of a red rag before a bull. It opens the sluices for many ugly digs at “Carpet-Bag Rule” and other morbid war reminiscences. There are still more sets, all differently affected. The long and short of the story is that Pensions

#### SOLDIERS' PENSION.

is a subject that often bobs up unexpectedly, and forthwith holds the center of the stage.

It was so on this occasion. Turning up in the most casual manner, Pensions became the subject of debate. Ex-Speaker Cannon leaped to the fray. Retorts and counter retorts flew thick. Representative Isaac R. Sherwood, quoting somebody, accused the ex-Speaker of having stood ready, at the previous session of Congress, to keep enough members of the Invalid Pension Committee away from each meeting to prevent a quorum. The ex-Speaker retorted that he looked his accuser “in his eye” and told him there was “not a word of truth” in what he said. And so it went on, until Representative Sherwood gave notice that the Democratic majority would at the earliest opportunity introduce a dollar-a-day pension bill; and, he added, banteringly addressing the Republican side of the House, “you will all vote for it.”

The sally restored good humor. It was greeted with laughter and applause. Small danger, under such circumstances, of the Members' class instinct sheltering itself behind strict parliamentary forms. A dollar-a-day invalid pension? A dollar-a-day for invalid soldiers? Victor L. Berger should have seized the occasion by the horns, and promptly said:

“And I, Mr. Speaker, now give notice that, when that dollar-a-day invalid pension bill is introduced, I shall move an amendment to the effect that the bill extend to invalid workmen, those veterans without whom all other veterans are as nothing; those veterans who have left eyes, legs, arms, fingers and the bulk of life on the Nation's most deadly battlefield—the mines, railroad tracks, mills, fac-



stories and shops, where they have fought unrequited, life-long battle to feed, clothe, house and otherwise support the Nation's life."

But Mr. Berger did nothing of the kind. That bugle call, sounding the note of the land's proletariat's interest and dignity, remained unsounded from the place and seat occupied by the "first Socialist in Congress." It could be no otherwise. The "only Socialist in Congress" was at the time incubating the addled egg of an average 35 cents and 71 mills a day pension bill for workingmen who performed the high to miraculous feat of reaching their 60th birthday.

#### BERGERS MISS NO. 21.

[DAILY PEOPLE, August 19, 1911]

### Social Jungle Conditions

On May 22d the aggressive representative of Law and Order, and of Republican plutocracy, Representative Edgar D. Crumpacker of Indiana, looked like a stag at bay, barely had he been speaking twenty minutes.

The initiative and referendum?—Why, devices of disorder! The recall of Judges?—why, an obvious scheme of Anarchy!

Representative Crumpacker was laying about him at this rate with such and similar "arguments" against the "attempted inroad upon constitutional government" when he was set upon by a number of his colleagues—Ben Jackson of Kentucky; Frank Buchanan, the "Labor" member from Illinois; Philip P. Campbell of Kansas; Scott Ferris of Oklahoma; H. Robert Fowler of Illinois; and a number of others. These did not even ask whether "the gentleman from Indiana" would yield. They simply "putted in" with suggestions and questions.

With such an example of tolerance on the part of the speaker on the floor, and with such a virtual invitation to "come one, come all!" one should think that the "first Socialist Congressman" would have felt the whole Socialist Movement tugging at his coat not to allow the challenge to go unaccepted by him.

Boiled down to their substance, Representative Crumpacker's arguments amounted to denying the fitness of our "cosmopolitan population," spread over so vast an area as our country, and among whom there was "a great diversity of ideals, social and political," with "material interests of various sections often antagonistic in their legislative wants and needs," to be entrusted with anything that approximated direct legislation.

With such a declaration of principles, on the part of Representative Crumpacker, amounting to a slap in the face of the democracy that Socialism advocates, and with such a challenge, as above indicated, to deny the slapper's premises, Victor L. Berger was in duty bound to break in with the question:

"Does not the gentleman from Indiana's position amount to saying that the theory of the Constitution, as the Constitution now stands, is false? The theory of the Constitution is that the officers, entrusted with government, are human, therefore fallible. The theory advanced by the gentleman from Indiana implies their infallibility. If that is not the theory implied, then the gentleman from Indiana is, by his argument, laying the foundation, or the approaches, for the total overthrow of the Constitution and its supplanting with another which shall proceed upon the theory of infallibility being the badge of the citizen



the moment he is elected to office—a revolution backward, theocracyward.

"Moreover, does the gentleman from Indiana realize the full import of his allegation that the country consists of antagonistic sections, and of the conclusion he draws therefrom, to wit, that therefore, the power to recall Judges must be withheld from the people? If this means anything, it means that the denial of democracy, a wrong, is to be justified by the existence of a shocking state of things—a Nation divided against itself. Sound reasoning, healthy statesmanship would not justify a wrong, and seek to perpetuate it, by reason of the existence of shocking state of things. Healthy statesmanship would seek to remove the existence of the shocking state of national conditions, and thereby remove the excuse for undemocratic principles.

"I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana whether he considers antagonism of interests the desirable thing for a Nation; and, if not, how can capitalism avoid the evil?"

But the acceptance of the challenge, and the counter-challenge that would have thrown a flashlight upon the jungle conditions of capitalist society, together with the civilized conditions that Socialism urges, and thereby helped disabuse the abused of the land by spreading the light from the elevated platform of Congress,—all that failed to be forthcoming.

Where was Berger when this opportunity presented itself? Was he in his seat, or out of his seat? If out of his seat, where was he, and doing what? If in his seat, was he asleep—or afraid?

## BERGER'S MISS NO. 22.

[DAUX PEOPLE, August 23, 1911]

**A Contrast**

Under the rules and usages of the House of Representatives it happens not infrequently that one or other of the two "floor leaders" allows a few minutes of his time to some Member who wishes to say a few words on something or other not relevant to the matter before the House, and that would not otherwise have an opportunity to be heard. As a rule, such a privilege is granted upon a matter that is considered of no importance, and it is not granted when anything of importance is before the House.

In keeping with this practice, on August 7, the House having under consideration House concurrent resolution 3 to print and bind 17,000 copies of the proceedings upon the unveiling of the statue of Baron von Steuben in Washington last December, the Republican floor leader, Representative James R. Mann of Illinois, yielded 10 minutes to Representative Victor L. Berger, which time, afterwards extended to five minutes more, Mr. Berger consumed in reading his arguments in favor of his Old-Age Pension bill. The paper read by Mr. Berger was withheld from the Record of that day (for improvement?) and appeared two days later, in the Congressional Record of August 9, neatly subdivided under captions.

Mr. Berger's Pension bill, itself an insult to the proletariat and to Socialism, has been dissected in a previous article. One turns with anxious expectation to the speech. Will it, perhaps, make up in argument for the radical worthlessness of the bill? No. The "speech" is a repeti-



tion of the worthless arguments with which Mr. Berger had, a week before, explained his bill to the reporters.

A fit companion-piece to the bill, the "speech" is an egregious miss.

"On the farm," the speech argues, "it is comparatively easy to take care of the aged." How so? The reason only increases one's amazement. "There is plenty of room on the farm. And even old people can usually do some chores—enough to make up for the slight expense of their keep. It is thus no special hardship for their friends and relatives to take care of them."

Socialism stands on facts and reason. This argument flies in the face of both.

Between the farm and the city, the aged proletarian finds the farm a hell compared to the city. Of what earthly use to him is the "plenty of room on the farm" when the farm with that plenty of room is not his? So far from the "plenty of room on a farm" being an advantage, it is a positive disadvantage to the proletarian. The openness of the fields offers no obstacles for the dogs, set upon the "tramps,"—the insulting term that, in rural-feudal parlance, is applied to the unemployed and the looker for work—to see and reach their victims, and chase them away. What with that, and the inevitably feudal exercise of governmental functions by the rural property-holders themselves, the poor proletarian, especially when aged, is on the rocks in rural districts, without even a hole to creep and hide in, as the city offers. To give the palm to the farm above the city, as far as aged workers are concerned, may tickle the palates of the "Milkmen," the dairy property-holders of Waukesha county, whose vote,

by counteracting the heavy loss of Social Democratic votes in Milwaukee, helped for the nonce Mr. Berger over the stile into Congress; but the tickling of those palates is an act by which Socialist clarification suffers.<sup>1</sup>

Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia," p. 196, describes the condition of the aged and out-of-work in the rural districts of his time: "A subsistence is easily gained here: and if, by misfortunes, they are thrown on the charities of the world, those provided by their own country are so comfortable and so certain, that they never think of relinquishing them to become strolling beggars. Their situation, too, when sick, in the family of a good farmer, where every member is anxious to do them good offices, where they are visited by all the neighbors, who bring them little varieties which their sickly appetites may crave, and who take by rotation the nightly watch over them, when their condition requires it, is, without comparison, better than in a general hospital, where the sick, the dying and the dead, are crammed together in the same rooms, and often in the same beds." These Arcadian conditions "on the farms" no longer exist in this country.

Bad as this break is, worse, if possible, is the argument of the number of people whom the bill would benefit.

Mr. Berger estimates the number of persons more than 60 years old in 1910 at 5,800,000. That among these there are people three score years of age who do not belong to the proletarian class Mr. Berger realizes. How does he ascertain the number of the aged proletarian? Deducting 1,000,000 from the 5,800,000 as "foreign born or not citizens 15 years," he has 4,000,000 left. Of these 4,000,000 he considers 2,765,000 to be proletarians entitled to his proposed pension—in other words, a majority of the 4,000,000 persons more than 60 years old in the land are proletarians—in other words, a bouquet is thrown at capitalism.



Not so does capitalism treat its proletariat. The ripe old age of 60 is not theirs but as a comparative exception. Grey hairs, and not premature greyness, but the greyness of old age, is a badge of the property holding class. Long before the age for grey hairs arrives, death overtakes the majority of the workers. The old men in workingmen's districts and gatherings are rare; the old men in capitalist quarters and gatherings are conspicuously numerous. Not a majority, but a slim minority of "persons more than 60 years old" are proletarians—a damnable fact which betrays the cannibalic qualities of capitalism, and which "the first and only Socialist in Congress" not only knows not enough to expose, but helps to cover up.

Mr. Berger's fifteen minutes being over, the House turned its attention back to the virtual pension of the memory of the Baron—a providential contrast between the generous manner that the Capitalist Class remembers its own in, and niggardly plaster with which pure and simple Socialist politicians seek to cover the big, capitalist-inflicted sore on the proletariat body.

#### BERGER'S MISS NO. 23.

[DAIRY PEOPLE, August 28, 1911]

### The "Common People"

There is a big real estate suit—it is claimed to be the biggest real estate suit ever filed—now pending in the Federal Court at Portland, Ore. It is the case of the United States against the Oregon & California Railroad Co. Among the numerous evidences of a bourgeois government being of, by and for the bourgeois, the acts of government in connection with the starting of railroads are among

the most luminous. To take the workingmen under the arm and give him a lift—that is "paternalism," and must not be. To take the capitalist under the arm—that is "patriotic" and legitimate—that must and shall be.

Obedient to this principle, the Oregon & California Railroad Co. being projected, Congress, by act of April 10, 1869, supplemented by the act of May 4, 1870, granted to the company alternate sections of land aggregating 2,300,000 acres, with a proviso that the lands so granted be sold by the company to actual settlers "at prices not exceeding \$2.50 per acre."

The proviso will start no spooks in the minds of those who understand the spirit of Law. These know that a law is a weapon forged in the interest of the class that has the power to enact and to enforce the law. Accordingly, the proviso that the land be sold to settlers "at prices not exceeding \$2.50 per acre" did not confuse the Oregon & California Railroad Company. The grant of land was intended to assist the company to do business—first, by putting money into its pockets;—secondly, by furnishing it with settlers to pluck. Thoroughly posted on the law, the Oregon Railroad Company started to do business.

There is a superstition abroad that the business of a capitalist concern is determined by its name, that is, the name of the industry that it flies at its masthead:—if it calls itself "The Great American Clothing Company," that clothing is its only trade; if it calls itself "The Non-Ex-celled Mining Company," that coal or ore is its real and only stock in trade; if it calls itself "The Patriotic Publishing Company," that its real source of income is news; and so forth. Indeed, it was so at one time. One of the



achievements in the development of capital is to merge all, or a number of lines of business into one. A "Clothing Company" to-day, does at least as much business in real estate, in gas stock and other lines as in clothing; a "Mining Company" has at least as much interest in railroads and in banking, and other lines as in coal or ore; a "Publishing Company" most assuredly does a more thriving business in advertisements and blackmail than in news;—and so all along the line. To-day, a company, whatever its specific name, is in for BUSINESS, that is, for cash from whatever source. It was so with the company yeleft "Oregon & California Railroad."

Business (cash) being the burden of its song, and the price of real estate being on the upward bound on the Pacific Slope, the Oregon & California Railroad Company took its time leisurely in the matter of laying its rails and operating its plant, in the meantime becoming actually a dealer in real estate. Thus pursuing its business, when would-be settlers offered the company \$2.50 an acre, the company simply told them they were "exhibiting a lot of nerve" to demand at \$2.50 land "worth on an average \$25 per acre."

That would-be settlers, softies long fed on the pap of our bourgeois government's being a "government of, for and by the people," should snort, rear on their hind legs, and rush to court to "enforce the law" is in the nature of things. It is also in the nature of things that shyster lawyers in abundance should be found ready to collect fees from these softies. It is, however, not quite so completely in the nature of things that lawyers of higher caliber

should be found to take up these cases in real earnest. Yet such there were found.

There is in the land what may be called the Tribe of Lawyers—legal pundits above the shyster, and separate from the Corporation Constables. These gentlemen live in the past. The Lawyer's tribe arose with the bourgeois. As such they actually were an able and a doughty lot of paladins, the paladins of the "common people." Since then, however, the bourgeois has graduated out of the herd of the "common people," and bourgeois law has stepped into the shoes formerly occupied by feudal law. Of this development the Tribe of Lawyers knows nothing. Being lawyers without being jurists, the Tribe does not realize the effect that the change has wrought upon Law. They still believe that bourgeois law is the law of the "common people." To this Tribe belongs Representative A. W. Lafferty, of Oregon. He took up the case of the would-be settlers, fought it in the Oregon courts, found himself blocked in all directions by dilatory proceedings, and finally caused a resolution (House Joint Resolution 129) to be introduced in Congress directing the Attorney General to employ at least one resident attorney of the State of Oregon as associate counsel in behalf of the Government to aid in the prosecution of the suit, which the outcry of the \$2.50 folks caused the United States to humor them by starting against the Oregon & California Railroad Company—and which has languished ever since.

On July 15 Representative Lafferty had the floor in behalf of his joint resolution. Covertly poked fun at by ex-Speaker Cannon with a number of barbed questions, Representative Lafferty exhibited his back numberness by



parrying the ex-Speaker's thrusts with: "The Congress of the last generation in making this grant (the grant of 2,300,000 acres to the Oregon & California Railroad Co., with the \$2.50 an acre proviso) provided for the protection of the poor people of this country seeking homes, and the Congress of the present generation should see to it that the law is carried out in good faith."

Such a statement, embodying so big a bunch of false conceptions regarding "the poor people of this country seeking homes" was a trumpet blast challenging the "first and sole Socialist in Congress" to his feet with a musketry of questions, which, however answered, would have sent to the country, through the official record of the transactions of Congress, together with the poison of Representative Lafferty's words, the antidote of Socialist truth. Ex-Speaker Cannon had been doing so in behalf of his set, the now feudalized Top-Capitalist. Victor L. Berger did not do so in behalf of the American Proletariat, which he claims to represent. Why not? Because he is there only to prove with an unbroken succession of misses the utter ineptness of pure and simple political Socialism.

BERGER'S MISS NO. 24.

[DAILY PEOPLE, September 2, 1911]

### The Political State On the Rocks

The Apportionment bill was under consideration in the House on April 27th. The gist thereof was that the number of Representatives be increased from the present 391 to 433.

The "two sides"—Democratic and Republican—were agreed upon the bill. When, however, the debate got well under way the spectacle—passing droll, in view of the all

around agreement that the bill should pass—unfolded itself of extensive disagreement. Criticism and dissatisfaction cropped up from numerous corners; while the language of even the most loyal supporters of the bill was one of apology, rather than of aggressive defense. Evidently nobody was really satisfied.

Representative William C. Houston, of Tennessee, in charge of the bill, argued, correctly enough, that a legislative body should not be large, lest its unwieldiness render deliberation next to impossible. The present membership of the House, 391, he considered quite large enough. To increase the number by 42, he conceded, was a move in the wrong direction. But what help was there for it? If the desirable size of a legislative body was to be kept exclusively in mind, another evil would be incurred. The House was a *representative* body. Representatives could hardly represent constituencies too large and of diverse interests to be well acquainted with them. Already the constituency, over 200,000 population, of a Representative to Congress was by far the largest of any existing parliament—three, and four, and five times as large as most, about 50,000 larger than the largest of them, the German parliament. If constituencies were to be kept down to a reasonable figure, the number of Representatives to Congress would rise to unwieldy dimensions; if, on the contrary, the representation in Congress was to be kept down to deliberate size, then the constituencies would swell to a size unrepresentable by a Representative. The bill was a compromise between the two horns of the dilemma—it raised the constituency slightly, to 211,877, and the representation in the House to 438.



Representative Edgar D. Crumpacker, of Indiana, the leader on the Republican side for the occasion, opened the flood-gates of criticism. While accepting the theories advanced by Representative Houston, and stating his intention to vote for the bill, he also announced his intention of offering an amendment which, he claimed, would obviate the danger of Congress—ten years hence, when the 14th Census will have been taken, and when a still larger population will have to be considered—being confronted with the problem that confronts the present Congress, and, perhaps, yield to the pressure for increased representation. The purport of the amendment was that, under subsequent censuses, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor should divide the aggregate population by the arbitrary number of 433, and thus determine the number of Representatives that each State was to be entitled to.

The clumsiness of the proposition escaped nobody. From that moment on criticisms, objections and further suggestions followed thick and fast, till the kink was inextricable.

Against Representative Crumpacker's threatened amendment two sets of objections were advanced. In the first place, what Congress did, Congress could undo. To shift this year the trouble to the shoulders of a Cabinet officer, would not prevent Congress next year from reassuming the trouble. In the second place, the impracticability of constituencies excessively large was not met, on the contrary, it would be incurred and established. One Representative shouted, against the objection: "Where, Mr. Chairman, is the increase in membership going to stop?" A still clumsier proposition came from Representative

Waggoner Sherley, of Kentucky—to fix the ratio (size of constituencies) small enough and the total (number of Representatives) large enough" so as to insure the States against the loss of membership in the House, ten years hence.

An even inept, because utterly childish, suggestion was that the difficulty could be obviated by rearranging the seats so that "the Members will be seated close together and be brought nearer."

Nor did radical bourgeoisdom fail to air itself, and render confusion worse confounded. Representative James L. Slayden, of Texas, wanted to know why it would not be "the wiser thing to have a constituency of 25,000 or 50,000 people," and Ollie M. James of Kentucky declaimed against the idea of a small body being wiser than a large body, as "a doctrine upon which thrones have been built and monarchies sustained," and as the "argument of the crown and the scepter."

Was such a spectacle an instance of parliamentary ineptness? No. In most other instances of false reasoning on the part of our bourgeois lawmakers, the suspicion is justified that they know they are reasoning falsely, but their class interests compel them to play the hypocrites. In this instance, they were honest, honest on account of the density of their bourgeois ignorance regarding the issue that was "running up their trousers."

The issue that confronted Congress was the death rattle of "Political Government." The thing is being choked to death by its own swelling and ulcerating tonsils, so to speak. A legislative body can not be large, or deliberation ceases: a constituency of diverse and conflicting interests must be



small, or it can not be represented. The cry, Where, Mr. Chairman, is the increase in the membership of the House of Representatives going to stop!—that cry is smothered by the counter cry, Where, Mr. Chairman, is the increase in the constituencies of diverse and conflicting interests going to stop! And vice versa. The reduction, *a. i.*, therefore, the practicability, of the one, necessarily implies the increase, and, therefore, the impracticability of the other. At first, the incompatibility of the two institutions is not perceptible. The time presently arrives when, each rendering the other impossible, they cancel each other, and their joint product, "Political Government," is at an end.

It is no accident that, of all capitalist countries, the United States is that in which the irreconcilability of "representation" and "constituency" is first coming to a head. Of all countries, the United States is completest capitalist, hence, it outlines clearest on the horizon the approaching downfall of Class Rule Government; hence, also, it prescribes with parallel distinctness the organization of the Socialist or Industrial Republic and Administration, where, not constituencies of DIVERS AND CONFLICTING INTERESTS, but constituencies of INTEGRAL INDUSTRIES are the basis and the source of representation—where, accordingly, the requirements for representative deliberation, and the magnitude of the constituency, do not run foul of each other.

During the discussion in the House the interruptions and interpolated speeches were frequent. In reading the report of the debate one anxiously hopes to see Victor L. Berger taking a hand. It was not even necessary to go through the formality of asking the "gentleman from So

and So to yield." Both the leaders in that debate—Houston and Crumpacker—who "controlled the time" were anxious for the fullest and freest expression of opinion to assist them out of the trouble. Without a doubt "the first Socialist in Congress" would have found no difficulty to secure from either "leader" at least fifteen minutes, during which to throw light upon the situation inside of Congress, and outside of Congress, into the public mind—inside of Congress, to prove the futility of their paltry make-shifts; outside of Congress, to the masses addressed from that conspicuous platform, to urge on their organizing themselves industrially, that is, their getting ready the administrative constituencies of the approaching Future which are to take the place of the present less and less possible constituencies. But "the first Socialist in Congress" again, and in regulation form, was weighed and found wanting.

And how else could it be? Himself a pure and simple political Socialist, his mentality upon the subject was at a par with that of his bourgeois colleagues—neither he nor they having the remotest inkling of the governmental evolution that is undermining the "Political Government" and is raising the "Industrial Administration."

BERGER'S MISS NO. 25.

[DAILY PEOPLE, September 7, 1911]

### Internationality of the Social Question

Great was the applause in the House and the gratification of the Republican Members on May 6, and proportionally the feeling of discomfiture on the Democratic side, on the occasion of ex-Speaker Cannon's climaxing his exposure of the Democratic Members by indignantly charging



that what they had done was "to answer a hysterical cry made by the demagogues and the Democrats and by the newspapers about the high cost of living when the necessities of life were as cheap here as elsewhere in the world."

The ex-Speaker was anxious to answer questions. He laid himself open, expressly, for them. He expressly invited them to be made at the close of his speech. The Democrats sat there cowed by the ex-Speaker's strong personality and the remorseless exposure of their duplicity and political chicanery. Only one dared interrogate him. None other followed suit, and Cannon's speech closed amid loud applause "on the Republican side," the applause being uninterrupted, or its subsidence punctuated by a single question from the "Democratic side."

Here was another choice opportunity for the "Socialist side" to be heard from:

"If 'the necessities of life were as cheap'—the gentleman from Illinois surely means 'no dearer,' or 'as dear'—there as elsewhere in the world,' is not the conclusion inevitable that the affliction of a towering cost of living, unaccompanied with a proportional increase in the wage earner's income, is an affliction against which a 'republican form of government' is no protection? Is not the admission made by the gentleman from Illinois an admission of one of the fundamental contentions of Socialism that the 'form of government,' even if the same be republican, is no better, so far as the wellbeing of Labor is concerned, than where the form of government is monarchic? Has not the gentleman from Illinois by his statement, and correct the statement was, confirmed the Socialist principle that even the best 'form of government' must be supplemented by demo-

cratic material, or economic, conditions, that is, by a democratic system of production, which, of course, includes distribution, before the Working Class can be emancipated from the slave status of merchandise, a merchandise, at that, whose price ever lags behind its cost of existence? Does the gentleman from Illinois realize that the well deserved shower of blows which he administered to 'the Democratic side' fell 'simultaneously and at once' with equal weight upon 'the Republican side'?"

Was "the Socialist side" of the House heard from to this effect? No. The "Democratic side" lay silent, cowed. Was "the Socialist side" equally cowed, being equally silent?

BERGER'S MISS NO. 26.

[DAIRY PEOPLE, September 9, 1911]

### Initiative, Referendum, Recall

A Red Letter Day in the annals of Representative Scott Ferris of Oklahoma was May 22d.

On that day the vibrant radicalism of the Oklahoman had full swing. Initiative, Referendum, even Recall—this was the trinity before which Mr. Ferris—like David of old, when the Ark was wheeled into the City of Zion—danced to the rhythm of a flow of eloquence plentiful and restless. Particularly enthusiastic was the Representative over the Initiative and Referendum. With these once established in Nevada to begin with, "full power" was henceforth to be enjoyed by the citizen "to play his part in initiating legislation."

However necessary representative government is when population becomes too numerous to meet in "Committee of the Whole" and itself attend directly to legislation, it